

INTERNATIONAL HYDROGRAPHIC ORGANIZATION



**XVIIth
INTERNATIONAL
HYDROGRAPHIC CONFERENCE**

7 – 11 May

2007

MONACO

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS

VOLUME 1

INTERNATIONAL HYDROGRAPHIC ORGANIZATION



**XVIIth INTERNATIONAL HYDROGRAPHIC CONFERENCE
Monaco, 7-11 May 2007**

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS

VOLUME 1

published by the
International Hydrographic Bureau
4, Quai Antoine 1er
B.P. 445 - 98011 MONACO Cedex
Principality of Monaco
Telefax : (377) 93 10 81 40
E-Mail: info@ihb.mc
Web-site: www.iho.shom.fr

INTERNATIONAL HYDROGRAPHIC ORGANIZATION

LIST OF MEMBER STATES (2007)

- * ALGERIA
- * ARGENTINA
- * AUSTRALIA
- * BAHRAIN
- * BANGLADESH
- * BELGIUM
- * BRAZIL
- * CANADA
- * CHILE
- * CHINA
- * COLOMBIA
- * CROATIA
- * CUBA
- * CYPRUS
- * DEMOCRATIC PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF KOREA
- DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF CONGO
- * DENMARK
- DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
- * ECUADOR
- * EGYPT
- * ESTONIA
- * FIJI
- * FINLAND
- * FRANCE
- * GERMANY
- * GREECE
- GUATEMALA
- * ICELAND
- * INDIA
- * INDONESIA
- * ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN
- * ITALY
- JAMAICA
- * JAPAN
- * KUWAIT
- * LATVIA
- * MALAYSIA
- * MAURITIUS
- * MEXICO
- * MONACO
- * MOROCCO
- * MOZAMBIQUE
- * MYANMAR
- * NETHERLANDS
- * NEW ZEALAND
- * NIGERIA
- * NORWAY
- * OMAN
- * PAKISTAN
- * PAPUA NEW GUINEA
- * PERU
- * PHILIPPINES
- * POLAND
- * PORTUGAL
- * REPUBLIC OF KOREA
- * REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA
- * ROMANIA
- * RUSSIAN FEDERATION
- * SAUDI ARABIA
- * SERBIA
- * SINGAPORE
- * SLOVENIA
- * SPAIN
- * SRI LANKA
- SURINAME
- * SWEDEN
- * SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC
- * THAILAND
- * TONGA
- TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO
- * TUNISIA
- * TURKEY
- * UKRAINE
- UNITED ARAB EMIRATES
- * UNITED KINGDOM
- * UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
- * URUGUAY
- * VENEZUELA

* Represented at the 17th International Hydrographic Conference.



**XVIIth INTERNATIONAL HYDROGRAPHIC CONFERENCE
XVII^e CONFERENCE HYDROGRAPHIQUE INTERNATIONALE**

See List of Participants from page 3 to page 18

VOLUME I

TABLE OF CONTENTS - VOLUME I

	Page
GENERAL INFORMATION	
General Description	1
List of Participants	3
Agenda	19
Programme	22
Officers of the Conference	25
List of Exhibitors	26
OPENING ADDRESSES	
By the President of the Directing Committee	27
By the President of the XVIIth International Hydrographic Conference.....	30
By His Serene Highness Prince Albert II of Monaco	32
PROPOSALS	
Proposals submitted to the Conference	35
DECISIONS	
Decisions of the Conference	93
SUMMARY RECORDS	
Finance Committee	109
Plenary Sessions.....	121

GENERAL INFORMATION

GENERAL INFORMATION

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE CONFERENCE

The XVIIth International Hydrographic Conference was held at the Rainier III Auditorium in Monaco, from 7 to 11 May 2007. It was attended by 248 delegates from 71 Member States and 36 Observers from non IHO Member States and International Organizations. A meeting of the Finance Committee was held on 5 May. Two Exhibitions, one of IHO Member States charts and a Commercial Exhibition ran from 7 to 10 May.

During the first plenary session on the morning of 7 May, Dr Wynford Williams (UK) and Dr Savithri Narayanan the Dominion Hydrographer of Canada, were elected as President and Vice-President respectively of the Conference.

The Conference was opened on Monday 7 May by HSH Prince Albert II who also presented the Prince Albert Ist Medal on Hydrography to VAdm A. Maratos and the International Cartographic Association Prize was awarded to Australia. The President of the Directing Committee and the President of the Conference delivered Opening Addresses. During the Opening Ceremony the new IHO Member States, Saudi Arabia, Romania and Mauritius, formally presented their flags to the Organization. Admiral Michael L. Abramov, the Chief of the Naval Staff of the Russian Federation addressed the Conference. After the Opening Ceremony HSH Prince Albert II opened the Commercial Exhibition and toured the exhibits.

24 Proposals were presented by the SPWG, Member States and the Bureau and were approved at the Conference. It is worth noting that the Conference approved amendments to the General and Financial Regulations and the Rules of Procedure of the Assembly, Council and Finance Committee that will be implemented when the new structure of the Organization has been approved by Member States, in accordance with Article XXI of the IHO Convention. Also the Conference approved the Work Program and Budget of the Organization for the next 5-year period and considered various reports on the work carried out by the Organization during the past 5 years. The Conference approved two Resolutions with which Member States should comply and the WEND Principles in order for the IHO to achieve adequate coverage, availability, consistency and quality of ENC's by 2010 and to support mandatory carriage requirements of ECDIS by IMO which will further accelerate the production of ENC's.

An important item on the Agenda of the XVIIth I.H. Conference was the election of the new Directing Committee. This took place on Friday 11 May: Vice Admiral Alexandros MARATOS (Greece) was elected President and Captain Hugo GORZIGLIA (Chile) and Captain Robert WARD (Australia) were elected as Directors for the period 2007-2012.

The following Hydrographic vessels visited the port of Monaco during the Conference: HMS ECHO (UK), GALETEA (Italy) and SNELLIUS (Netherlands).

The Conference adopted a Resolution thanking HSH Prince Albert II and his Government for the support provided to this important event. Thanks were also extended to all national and international delegates for their contribution to the discussions and the IHB Staff who worked very efficiently for the success of the Conference.

The Conference decided to have an Extraordinary International Hydrographic Conference early June 2009, with the main subject to examine and approved an amended/improved Strategic Plan.

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

DELEGATES FROM MEMBER GOVERNMENTS

ALGERIA/ALGERIE

Head of Delegation/Chef de délégation

Lt. Colonel Mohamed MOULOUDJ, Head, Naval Forces Hydrographic Service

Alternate and Advisor/Adjoint et conseiller

Cdr. Abdelkader MENASRI, Head, Hydrographic Support Office

Cdr. Djamel BENYAHIA, Head Hydrographic Surveys

ARGENTINA/ARGENTINE

Head of Delegation/Chef de délégation

Rear Admiral Andres Roque DI VINCENZO

Alternate and Advisor/Adjoint et conseiller

Cdr. Jorge César LAPENTA, Head, Hydrographic Department

AUSTRALIA/AUSTRALIE

Head of Delegation/Chef de délégation

Captain Rod NAIRN, RAN, Hydrographer

Alternate and Advisor/Adjoint et conseiller

Captain Robert WARD, RAN, Deputy Hydrographer

Mr. Jasbir RANDHAWA, Manager, External Relations

BAHRAIN - BAHREÏN

Head of Delegation/Chef de délégation

Mr. Khalid A. Hameed ALHAMMADI

Alternate and Advisor/Adjoint et conseiller

Mr. Naji Sabt SALIM SABT

Cdr. (Retd.) Oli GRAVGAARD

BANGLADESH

Head of Delegation/Chef de délégation

Commodore Mohammad Habibur RAHMAN BHUIYAN, (C), psc, BN

BELGIUM/BELGIQUE

Head of Delegation/Chef de delegation

Mr. Guido DUMON, Head, Flemish Hydrography

BRAZIL/BRESIL

Head of Delegation/Chef de délégation

Vice Admiral Edison LAWRENCE Mariath Dantas, Director

Alternate and Advisor/Adjoint et conseiller

Captain Carlos Alberto PÊGAS Ferreira

Captain (Retd.) Carlos Augusto MEDEIROS de Albuquerque

Captain (Retd.) Wesley CAVALHEIRO Wandermurem

CANADA

Head of Delegation/Chef de délégation

Dr. Savithri NARAYANAN, Dominion Hydrographer and Director General, CHS

Alternate and Advisor/Adjoint et conseiller

Mr. Sean HINDS, Senior Advisor, Hydrography

Mr. Dale NICHOLSON, Regional Director, Hydrography

Mr. Abdelaziz SAHEB-ETTABA, Counsel

CHILE/CHILI

Head of Delegation/Chef de délégation

Captain Jorge L. IBARRA, Director

Alternate and Advisor/Adjoint et conseiller

Lt. Cdr. Enrique SILVA

CHINA/CHINE

Head of Delegation/Chef de délégation

Mr. Heping ZHENG

Alternate and Advisor/Adjoint et conseiller

Mr. Binsheng XU

Ms. Tingying BAI

Mr. Kwok-Chu NG, Hong Kong Hydrographic Office

Mr. Chung Kwong YEUNG

Mr. Vun Leong TONG, Macau

Mr. Chunming XU

Mr. Jiansheng YUAN

COLOMBIA/COLOMBIE

Head of Delegation/Chef de délégation

Rear Admiral Daniel IRIARTE ALVIRA

Alternate and Advisor/Adjoint et conseiller

Captain Ivan Fernando CASTRO MERCADO

CROATIA/CROATIE

Head of Delegation/Chef de délégation

Dr. Zvonko GRŽETIĆ, Director

Alternate and Advisor/Adjoint et conseiller
Captain Željko BRADARIĆ

CUBA

Head of Delegation/Chef de délégation
Colonel Eloy Luís ALUM ORTIZ, Director

Alternate and Advisor/Adjoint et conseiller
Lt. Cdr. Angel ACANDA REYES

CYPRUS/CHYPRE

Head of Delegation/Chef de délégation
Mr. Christos ZENONOS, Chief Hydrographer

DENMARK/DANEMARK

Head of Delegations/Chef de délégation
Mr. Svend ESKILDSEN, Director General

Alternate and Advisor/Adjoint et conseiller
Mr. Jesper JARMBÆK, Director General
Cdr. Lars HANSEN
Mr. J. P. HARTMANN

ECUADOR/EQUATEUR

Head of Delegation/Chef de délégation
Cdr. Mario PROAÑO SILVA, Director

Alternate and Advisor/Adjoint et conseiller
Lt. Cdr. Carlos ZAPATA

EGYPT/EGYPTE

Head of Delegation/Chef de délégation
Captain Elmoghanny ASHRAF

ESTONIA/ESTONIE

Head of Delegation/Chef de délégation
Mr. Toivo PRELA, Deputy Director General, EMA

Alternate and Advisor/Adjoint et conseiller
Dr. Vaido KRAAV
Dr. Jaan LUTT
Mr. Tõnis SIILANARUSK

FIJI/FIDJI

Head of Delegation/Chef de délégation
Mr. Felix MAHARAJ, Chief Hydrographer

Alternate and Advisor/Adjoint et conseiller

Mr. Sunil KUMAR, Technical Officer (Cartography)

FINLAND/FINLANDE

Head of Delegation/Chef de délégation

Mr. Jukka VARONEN, National Hydrographer, Head of Hydrographic Surveys Division

Alternate and Advisor/Adjoint et conseiller

Ms. Tiina TUURNALA, Director, Hydrographic Department
Mr. Jarmo MÄKINEN, Deputy Director, Head of Chart Division
Mr. Juha KORHONEN, Assistant Hydrographer

FRANCE

Head of Delegation/Chef de délégation

IGA Gilles BESSERO, Director, SHOM

Alternate and Advisor/Adjoint et conseiller

IGA Michel LE GOUIC, Deputy Directeur/*Directeur adjoint*
CRC Richard LUIGI, Head of Administration/*Chef du Bureau administration*
ICETA Yves GUILLAM, Head of External relations/*Chef du Bureau études générales*
ICETA (Retd.) Jean-Louis BOUET-LEBOEUF, Senior International Consultant/
Chargé de mission
EV2 Hélène LECORNU, Public Relations/*Chargé de Communication*
Mr. Jean LAPORTE

GERMANY/ALLEMAGNE

Head of Delegation/Chef de délégation

Prof. Peter EHLERS, President and Professor

Alternate and Advisor/Adjoint et conseiller

Mr. Horst HECHT
Ms. Ingelore HERING
Prof. Dr. Dietmar GRUENREICH
Dr. Hans-Werner SCHENKE
Prof. Dr. Delf EGGE
Prof. Dr. Rainer LAGONI

GREECE/GRECE

Head of Delegation/Chef de délégation

Commodore Anastasios SKLAVIDIS

Alternate and Advisor/Adjoint et conseiller

Ambassador Alexandros RALLIS
Dr. Emmanuel GOUNARIS, Minister Counsellor, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Mr. Ioannis PAPAIOANNOU

ICELAND/ISLANDE

Head of Delegation/Chef de delegation

Mr. Hilmar HELGASON, Hydrographer

INDIA/INDE

Head of Delegation/Chef de délégation

Rear Admiral B.R. RAO, Chief Hydrographer

INDONESIA/INDONESIE

Head of Delegation/Chef de délégation

Admiral Willem RAMPANGILEI

Alternate and Advisor/Adjoint et conseiller

Captain MAGHONI, Head of Survey Division

Captain ESTU PRABOWO, Group of Research

Commander TRISMADI

ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN/REPUBLIQUE ISLAMIQUE D'IRAN

Head of Delegation/Chef de délégation

Mr. S. Ali ESTIRI, Director General of Maritime Affairs, Ports and Shipping Organization, PSO

Alternate and Advisor/Adjoint et conseiller

Mr. Ali MORADI, Senior Marine Safety Officer, PSO

Mr. M. Hassan KHODAMMOHAMMADI, Head of Hydrography Section, NCC

Mr. M. Hossein MOSHIRI, Hydrographer, NCC

Mr. M. Hassan NAMI, President, National Geographical Organization, NGO

Mr. Hamid MASOUMI, Head of Cartography, NGO

Captain Ali-Reza RIAHI-NABI, NGO

Mr. Bahman TAJFIROOZ, Darya Tarsim Consulting Engineers

Mr. Gholamreza RAHIMI, Darya Tarsim Consulting Engineers

ITALY/ITALIE

Head of Delegation/Chef de délégation

Rear Admiral Pierpaolo CAGNETTI, Director, Italian Hydrographic Institute

Alternate and Advisor/Adjoint et conseiller

Commander Enrico ANTONINO

Commander Paolo LUSIANI

Lt. Cdr. Alessandro NOBILI

Mrs. Paola PRESCIUTTINI

JAPAN/JAPON

Head of Delegation/Chef de délégation

Dr. Hideo NISHIDA

Alternate and Advisor/Adjoint et conseiller

Dr. Shigeru KATO

Dr. Arata SENGOKU

Mr. Hiroyuki IWAKI

Mr. Shigeru NAKABAYASHI

Dr. Shoichi OSHIMA

Mr. Koji YONETANI, Counsellor, Embassy of Japan in France

**KOREA, DEMOCRATIC PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF/ COREE, REPUBLIQUE POPULAIRE
DEMOCRATIQUE DE**

Head of Delegation/Chef de délégation

Vice-Admiral Gyong O JO, Director, Hydrographic Department of DPRK

Alternate and Advisor/Adjoint et conseiller

Captain Myong Chol O, Vice-Director

Commander Kon Yong KIM, Researcher

KOREA, REPUBLIC OF/COREE, REPUBLIQUE DE

Head of Delegation/Chef de délégation

Mr. Young-wan SONG

Alternate and Advisor/Adjoint et conseiller

Mr. Yeong Jin YEON, Director General, NORI

Mr. Il CHUNG

Ms. Young-Ju OH

Ms. Eun-Ji SEO

Mr. Sok-Chang KWON

Mr. Joon-Ho JIN

Mr. Young-Bae KIM, Director, NORI

Mr. Yong HUH

Mr. Jung-Hyun KIM, International Affairs Officer, NORI

Mr. Su-Ho LEE

H.E.Mr. Young Won KIM

Dr. Ki-Suk LEE

Dr. Sung-Jae CHOO

Dr. Sang-Hyun SUH

KUWAIT/KOWEÏT

Head of Delegation/Chef de délégation

Mr. Abdullatif Haji ABDULHADI, Controller of Arabian & International World
External Relations & Information Department

Alternate and Advisor/Adjoint et conseiller

Mr. Jamal M.AL-KANDARI, Tech. Department-Transport Sector

Mr. Ali Abdullah AL-KANDARI, Head of Hydrographic Survey Section

LATVIA/LETTONIE

Head of Delegation/Chef de délégation

Mr. Ansis ZELTIŅŠ, Director, Maritime Administration of Latvia

Alternate and Advisor/Adjoint et conseiller

Mr. Jānis KRASTIŅŠ, Head, Latvian Hydrographic Service

MALAYSIA/MALAISIE

Head of Delegation/Chef de délégation

Commander Bin Hassan ZAAIM, Deputy Director General

MAURITIUS/MAURICE

Head of Delegation/Chef de délégation

Mr. RAMCHURN, Counsellor, Embassy of the Republic of Mauritius, Paris

MEXICO/MEXIQUE

Head of Delegation/Chef de délégation

Commander Mario GONGORA, Director Hydrographic Office

Alternate and Advisor/Adjoint et conseiller

Lt. Cdr. Marco Antonio DIAZ, Chief, Department of Security, Navigation and Information

MONACO

Head of Delegation/Chef de délégation

Mr. Robert CALCAGNO, Government Counsellor for Facilities, the Environment and Town Planning

Alternate and Advisor/Adjoint et conseiller

Mr. Laurent ANSEMI, Advisor to HSH Prince Albert II and IHO Legal Advisory Committee Member (LAC)

Mr. Maurice GAZIELLO, Chairman of the IHO Finance Committee

Mr. Jean-Louis BISSUEL, Director, Maritime Affairs

Mr. Jean-Michel MANZONE, Technical Advisor, Department of Facilities, Urban Planning and Environment

Mr. Frédéric PARDO, Administrator Legal Affairs Department

MOROCCO/MAROC

Head of Delegation/Chef de délégation

Captain M'hammed NABIL, Head of Hydrographic and Cartographic Division

MOZAMBIQUE

Head of Delegation/Chef de délégation

Mr. Select MUNDLOVO, Director

Alternate and Advisor/Adjoint et conseiller

Mr. Humberto MUTEVUIE, Head of Hydrographic Department

MYANMAR

Head of Delegation/Chef de délégation

Commodore Maung OO LWIN, Senior Adviser, Myanmar National Hydrographic Centre

Alternate and Advisor/Adjoint et conseiller

Mr. Mang HAU THANG, Assistant Director, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

NETHERLANDS/PAYS-BAS

Head of Delegation/Chef de délégation

Captain Floor de HAAN, Hydrographer, Royal Netherlands Navy, RNLN

Alternate and Advisor/Adjoint et conseiller
PgD NT Erwin WORMGOOR

NEW ZEALAND/NOUVELLE- ZELANDE

Head of Delegation/Chef de délégation
Mr. John SPITTAL, National Topographer/Hydrographer

Alternate and Advisor/Adjoint et conseiller
Mr. Geoff HOWARD, Senior Manager, National Hydrographic Services in NZ
Lt. Cdr. David FIELD, Military Hydrographic Representation

NIGERIA

Head of Delegation/Chef de délégation
Captain Aching MAIHA M.

Alternate and Advisor/Adjoint et conseiller
Commodore (Retd.) Joe ABULU O.
Cdr. Nuhu BALAJ.

NORWAY/NORVEGE

Head of Delegation/Chef de délégation
Commander Frode KLEPSVIK, Commander/Hydrographer

Alternate and Advisor/Adjoint et conseiller
Commander Terje LANGVIK, Commander/Dep. Hydrographer
Mr. Kjell Magne OLSEN, International Co-ordinator
Mr. Kurt ELLINGSEN, Assistant Director, Norwegian Ministry of Environment
Mr. Chr. Tore SVENSEN, Assistant Director, Norwegian Mapping Authority, NMA

OMAN

Head of Delegation/Chef de délégation
Eng. Qasim AL SHIZAWI

Alternate and Advisor/Adjoint et conseiller
Commander Richard DOBSON
Lt. Cdr. Khalid AL JABRI
Captain Ali AL RUZAIKI

PAKISTAN

Head of Delegation/Chef de délégation
Cdr. Fiaz HUSSAIN

PAPUA NEW GUINEA/PAPOUASIE-NOUVELLE-GUINEE

Head of Delegation/Chef de délégation
Mr. Joseph KUNDA

PERU/PEROU

Head of Delegation/Chef de délégation
Rear Admiral Augusto ZEGARRA Oviedo

Alternate and Advisor/Adjoint et conseiller
Commander Rodolfo SABLICH Luna Victoria

PHILIPPINES

Head of Delegation/Chef de délégation
Captain Audie A. VENTIREZ

Alternate and Advisor/Adjoint et conseiller
Ms. Georgia E. VENTURA

POLAND/POLOGNE

Head of Delegation/Chef de délégation
Captain Piotr PERNACZYŃSKI, Chief, Hydrographic Office of the Polish Navy,
HOPN

Alternate and Advisor/Adjoint et conseiller
Captain Henryk NITNER, Deputy Hydrographer

PORTUGAL

Head of Delegation/Chef de délégation
Vice-Admiral José Augusto de BRITO, General Director

Alternate and Advisor/Adjoint et conseiller
Commander Carlos Ventura SOARES, Director, Technical Services
Commander Fernando Freitas ARTILHEIRO, Head, Hydrographic Division
Miss Teresa SANCHES, International Relations

ROMANIA/ROUMANIE

Head of Delegation/Chef de délégation
Cdr. Romeo BOȘNEAGU, Deputy Chief, Maritime Hydrographic Directorate

Alternate and Advisor/Adjoint et conseiller
Lt. Commander Eng. Octavian BUZATU, Head, ENC Section, Maritime Hydrographic
Directorate

RUSSIA/RUSSIE

Head of Delegation/Chef de délégation
Admiral Michael L. ABRAMOV, Chief of Naval Staff

Alternate and Advisor/Adjoint et conseiller
Rear Admiral Sergey V. KOZLOV, Chief Department Navigation and Oceanography
Rear Admiral Sergey P. ALEXEEV, Chief Navigational and Hydrographic Research
Institute
Captain Yuriy POZHKOV, Chief Oceanographic Section, Department of Navigation
and Oceanography

Captain Vadim M. SOBOLEV, Chief International Section
Captain Sergey V. TRAVIN, Chief Hydrographic Equipment Repair Factory
Mr. Gennady BATALIN, Chief Federal State Unitary Hydrographic Department
Mr. Anatoly MASSANYUK, Deputy Chief Federal State Unitary Hydrographic Department
Mr. Alexander KARASEV (MOFA)
Captain V. KOZLOV

SAUDI ARABIA/*ARABIE SAOUDITE*

Head of Delegation/*Chef de délégation*

Lt. General Morayyea Bin Hassan AL-SHAHRANI, Director of General Directorate of Military Survey

Alternate and Advisor/*Adjoint et conseiller*

Rear Admiral Abdul Rahman Bin Mohamed AL SHEHRI, Director Hydrographic Department
General Abdullah Bin Abderahman AL SUHAIBANI, Saudi Military Attaché in France
Captain Mohamed Bin Abdallah AL THUKAIR, General Directorate of Military Survey
Colonel Mohamed Bin Hamed AL HARBI, General Directorate of Military Survey

SERBIA /*SERBIE*

Head of Delegation/*Chef de délégation*

Dr. Jasna MUŠKATIROVIĆ, Civ.Eng. Agency for Maintenance and Development of Inland Waterways (PLOVPUT)

Alternate and Advisor/*Adjoint et conseiller*

Mr. Tihomir STOŠIĆ, Hydrographic Surveyor

SINGAPORE/*SINGAPOUR*

Head of Delegation/*Chef de délégation*

Mr. Parry OEI

Alternate and Advisor/*Adjoint et conseille*

Mr. Jamie CHEN

SLOVENIA / *SLOVENIE*

Head of Delegation/*Chef de délégation*

Mr. Igor KARNICNIK

Alternate and Advisor/*Adjoint et conseiller*

Mr. Aljosa ZERJAL

SOUTH AFRICA (REPUBLIC OF)/*AFRIQUE DU SUD (REPUBLIQUE D')*

Head of Delegation/*Chef de délégation*

Captain Abri KAMPFER, Hydrographer, S.A. Navy

Alternate and Advisor/Adjoint et conseiller

Mr. Malcolm NELSON

Mr. Allan PETERSEN

SPAIN/ESPAGNE

Head of Delegation/Chef de délégation

Captain Fernando QUIROS CEBRIÁ, Director

Alternate and Advisor/Adjoint et conseiller

Cdr. Juan AGUILAR CAVANILLAS

SRI LANKA

Head of Delegation/Chef de délégation

Mr. Malawara A. ARIYAWANSA, Hydrographer

SWEDEN/SUEDE

Head of Delegation/Chef de délégation

Mr. Åke MAGNUSSON, Head of Hydrographic Service

Alternate and Advisor/Adjoint et conseiller

Ms. Maria GELIN, Director

SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC/REPUBLIQUE ARABE SYRIENNE

Head of Delegation/Chef de délégation

Eng . Ghefar BARAKAT

Alternate and Advisor/Adjoint et conseiller

Mrs. Fairouz CHAMSIN, Head, Division General Relationship

THAILAND/THAÏLANDE

Head of Delegation/Chef de délégation

Rear Admiral Prayuth NETRPRAPA, Deputy Director

Alternate and Advisor/Adjoint et conseiller

Captain Witoon TANTIGUN

TONGA

Head of Delegation/Chef de délégation

HE Sione Ngongo KIOA, Ambassador to the European Union

Alternate and Advisor/Adjoint et conseiller

Hon. Paul KARALUS, Minister of Transport, Kingdom of Tonga

TUNISIA/TUNISIE

Head of Delegation/Chef de délégation

Captain Rachid ESSOUSSI, Head, Hydrographic and Oceanographic Service

Alternate and Advisor/Adjoint et conseiller

Mr. Jamel CHRIGUI
Lt. Haythem KHERIJI

TURKEY/TURQUIE

Head of Delegation/Chef de délégation

Rear Admiral Mustafa IPTEŞ, Director

Alternate and Advisor/Adjoint et conseiller

Lt. Bülent GÜRSES

UKRAINE

Head of Delegation/Chef de délégation

Dr. Sergiy SYMONENKO, Head State Hydrographic Institution of Ukraine

Alternate and Advisor/Adjoint et conseiller

Mrs. Oksana SHELUDKO, Head, International Relations Section
Mr. Oleksandr BORYS, Head, Charting Branch
Mr. Oleg MARCHENKO
Mr. Mykola TSYMBAL

UNITED KINGDOM/ROYAUME-UNI

Head of Delegation/Chef de délégation

Mr. Mike ROBINSON, Chief Executive

Alternate and Advisor/Adjoint et conseiller

Rear Admiral Ian MONCRIEFF, National Hydrographer
Mrs. Liz DUNN
Captain Mike BARRITT
Mr. Chris SMITH
Mr. Bob HOOTON
Mr. Joe COLLINS
Mrs. Chris WALTON
Mrs. June THOMPSON
Captain Vaughan NAIL
Mr. Alan MAIDMENT, Vice-Chairman of the IHO Finance Committee

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA/ETATS-UNIS D'AMERIQUE

Head of Delegation/Chef de delegation

Rear Admiral Christian ANDREASEN, (Ret.), NOAA

Alternate and Advisor/Adjoint et conseiller

Mr. Peter DOHERTY
Mr. Steven KEATING
Mr. Steven DEBRECHT
Rear Admiral Timothy McGEE, NMOC
Captain John COUSINS, NMOC
Mr. Max VAN NORDEN
Captain Steve BARNUM, NOAA
Commander Gerd GLANG, NOAA
Ms. Meg DANLEY, NOAA

Ms. Denise WEBSTER, General Counsel, NGA
Mr. Keith ALEXANDER, Technical Advisor
Cdr. Brian CONNON, Technical Advisor, USN
Ms. Kathryn MORK, Technical Advisor, NOAA
Mr. Robert GREER, Technical Advisor, USA/Navy
Mr. John CARVIL, Technical Advisor, USA/Navy
Lt. David R. MARINO, NMOC
Mr. Ted FARIS, USA/State
Mr. Rob YOUNG, Counsel

URUGUAY

Head of Delegation/Chef de délégation
Captain Orestes PEREYRA

Alternate and Advisor/Adjoint et conseiller
Captain Gustavo MUSSO

VENEZUELA

Head of Delegation/Chef de délégation
Captain Ana Rosensil SUAREZ

Alternate and Advisor/Adjoint et conseiller
Commander Jesús JIMÉNEZ MUÑOZ

OBSERVERS

OBSERVERS FROM 2 PENDING MEMBER STATES

IRELAND/IRLANDE

Captain Michael PURCELL, Nautical Surveyor

QATAR

Mr. Ahmad MUSAED AL MOHANNADI
Mr. Vladan JANKOVIC, Head of Hydrographic Section
Captain Nael Mohammed Abdullah AL-KHALIDI, Legal Officer in Qatar Coast &
Borders Security Department

OBSERVERS FROM 8 NON-MEMBER STATES

ANGOLA

Mr. Salustiano F.P. FERREIRA, Instituto Marítimo Portuário de Angola (IMPA)
Mr. Manuel NARCISO, Hydrographic Specialist, IMPA

BENIN

Mr. Lazare GNONLONFIN, Technical Director, Port Authority of Cotonou
Mr. Célestin NOUDOFININ, Head of Hydrographic and Topographic Department

GUINEA/GUINEE

Mr. Bah SOULEYMANE, Head of Hydrographic Department, Port Authority of
Conakry

LIBYA/LIBYE

Cdr. Abualla AZABI
Cdr. Abulalem GHALYA

LITHUANIA/LITHUANIE

Mr. Evaldas ZACHAREVICIUS, Director, Lithuanian Maritime Safety Administration
Mr. Viktoras LIULYS, Head, Lighthouse and Hydrographic Department

MALTA/MALTE

Mr. Joseph BIANCO, Hydrographer

SENEGAL

Mr. Mamadou THIOUB, Head of Subdivision of Lights and Buoys
Representative from Ministry Maritime Economy

VIETNAM

Mr. Doi TRAN NGOC, Deputy Director General of MSC-1
Mr. Thuan NGUYEN VAN, Deputy General of MSC-2
Mr. Anh PHAM TUAN

OBSERVERS FROM 10 INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

INTERGOVERNMENTAL OCEANOGRAPHIC COMMISSION UNESCO (IOC)

Dr. Dmitri TRAVIN
Dr. Thorkild AARUP

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MARINE AIDS TO NAVIGATION AND Lighthouse AUTHORITIES (AISMA)

Mr. Torsten KRUUSE, IALA Secretary General

INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF SURVEYORS (IFSO)

Mr. Gordon JOHNSTON
Mr. Andrew LEYZACK

INTERNATIONAL MARITIME ORGANIZATION (IMO)

Mr. Gurpreet SINGHOTA, Head, Operational Safety Section, Maritime Safety Division

INTERNATIONAL RADIO-MARITIME COMMITTEE (IRTC) *

Mr. Tor SVANES

JAPAN HYDROGRAPHIC ASSOCIATION (JHA)

Dr. Kunio YASHIMA
Mr. Shigeshi MIMURA

PAN AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF GEOGRAPHY AND HISTORY (PAIGH)

Mr. Paul R. COOPER

REGIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE MARINE ENVIRONMENT (ROPME)

Dr. Hassan MOHAMMADI, Co-ordinator

**UNITED NATIONS DIVISION FOR OCEAN AFFAIRS AND THE LAW OF THE SEA
(DOALOS)**

Mr. Robert SANDEV, GIS Officer

UNIVERSITY OF PLYMOUTH

Mrs. Barbara BOND

* = Accredited Non-Governmental International Organizations (NGIO)
Organisations internationales non gouvernementales accréditées (OING)

FORMER IHB PRESIDENTS/DIRECTORS

Rear Admiral Sir David HASLAM
Rear Admiral Giuseppe ANGRISANO
Vice Admiral Alfredo CIVETTA
Mr. Adam J. KERR
Rear Admiral Neil GUY

CONF.17/G/01 Rev. 5

FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING AGENDADate: **05 May 2007**Venue: **Auditorium Rainier III, Monaco**

Item	Description	Documents
	FINANCE COMMITTEE	
A	Examination of the IHO Finance Report 2002-2006	CONF.17/F/01 rev.1
B	Examination of the Proposed IHO 5-Year Budget 2008-2012	CONF.17/F/02 rev.3 (Ref. Doc: CONF.17/REP/01 rev.1)
C	Consideration of the IHO 2008 Budget	CONF.17/F/03
D	Consideration of the Report of the Finance Committee Working Group on Salary Scheme for Secretary General and Directors under the new structure of the IHO. Letter from SHOM (France)	CONF.17/F/04 rev.1 CONF.17/F/05
E	Appointment of the external Auditor	(Info. doc. Letter from the present Auditor expressing willingness to continue)

XVIIth CONFERENCE AGENDADate: **07 - 11 May 2007**Venue: **Auditorium Rainier III, Monaco**

Item	Description	CONF.DOC
1	CONFERENCE ORGANIZATION	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcoming Remarks by the President of the Directing Committee. • Confirmation of the Election of the President and Election of the Vice President of Conference. • Election of the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Finance Committee. • Establishment of Eligibility Committee • Appointment of Rapporteurs • Appointment of Scrutineers Team • Adoption of the Agenda and Programme • Approval of the Table of Tonnages 	CONF.17/G/01 rev.5 CONF.17/G/03 rev.2
2	OPENING CEREMONY	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opening Address by the President of the Directing Committee. • Opening Address by the President of the Conference • Opening Address by HSH Prince Albert II of Monaco <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Presentation of the Albert 1st Medal (Vice Admiral A. Maratos) b) Prize for IHO Chart Exhibition at ICC 2005 (Australia) • Presentation of New Member States' Flags (Mauritius, Myanmar, Romania and Saudi Arabia) • Opening of Exhibitions Group Photo	CONF.17/MISC/01 CONF.17/MISC/02 CONF.17/MISC/03

3	CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSALS	
	<p>a) Submitted by the SPWG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal 1 SPWG Report Noting • Proposal 2 Approval of an Implementation Plan for the new IHO Structure • Proposal 3 Approval of the Amended IHO General Regulations • Proposal 4 Approval of the Amended IHO Financial Regulations • Proposal 5 Approval of the Rules of Procedure of the IHO Assembly • Proposal 6 Approval of the Rules of Procedure of the IHO Council • Proposal 7 Approval of the Rules of Procedure of the IHO Finance Committee • Proposal 8 Approval of the Re-structuring of IHO Committees and Other Groups • Proposal 9 Advanced entry into force of the Re-Structuring of IHO Committees and other Groups • Proposal 10 Chairmanship of HSCC and IRCC Committees • Proposal 11 Actions for the Implementation of Re-Structuring of the IHO Committees and other Groups • Proposal 12 Establishment of a Working Group to revise the IHO Strategic Plan • Proposal 13 Editorial Amendments to the Host Agreement • Proposal 14 Amendments to Technical Resolution T1.1 <p>b) Submitted by the IHO MSs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal 15 Approval of New Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure for the IHO Strategic Planning Working Group (WITHDRAWN) • Proposal 16 Amendment to Article 6 of the General Regulations and to Rule 5 of the Rules of Procedure for IHO Conferences regarding Observers, so as to comply with EIHC 3, Decision No.5 • Proposal 17 Cancelling a Conference Decision • Proposal 18 Provision of Regional Staff Officers for Capacity Building Effort 	<p>CONF.17/G/02 CONF.17/DOC.1 CONF.17/DOC.1</p> <p>CONF.17/DOC.2</p> <p>CONF.17/DOC.3</p> <p>CONF.17/DOC.4</p> <p>CONF.17/DOC.5</p> <p>CONF.17/DOC.6</p> <p>CONF.17/DOC.1</p> <p>(Ref. Doc. IHO M-1)</p> <p>(Ref. Doc. IHO M-3)</p> <p>CONF.17/G/02</p> <p>(Ref. Doc. IHO M-1)</p>

	CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSALS (cont.)	
	c) Submitted by the IHB <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal 19 Establishment of a Working Group to study and propose a new edition of the IHB Staff Regulations 	CONF.17/G/02
4	CONSIDERATION OF REPORTS	
	Consideration of the Reports on the Work Programme 2002-2007 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Programme 1 Cooperation between Member States and with International Organizations b) Programme 2 Capacity Building and Technical Cooperation c) Programme 3 Techniques and Standards support d) Programme 4 Information Management and Public Relations e) Programme 5 General Organization Development 	CONF.17/WP.1 CONF.17/WP.2 CONF.17/WP.3 CONF.17/WP.4 CONF.17/WP.5
5	WORK PROGRAMME 2008-2012	
	Approval of the Proposed IHO Work Programme 2008-2012	CONF.17/REP/01 rev.1
6	FINANCE COMMITTEE REPORT	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Presentation of the Finance Committee Report b) Approval of the Finance Report of the IHO 2002-2006 c) Approval of the IHO 5-year Budget 2008-2012 d) Appointment of the External Auditor e) Approval of the Report of the Finance Committee Working Group on Salary Scheme for Secretary General and Directors under the new structure of the IHO 	CONF.17/F/REP CONF.17/F/01 rev.1 CONF.17/F/02 rev.3 CONF.17/F/04 rev.1
7	REPORT OF THE ELIGIBILITY COMMITTEE	CONF.17/E/REP
8	ELECTION OF DIRECTORS	(Ref. Doc. IHO M-1)
9	UNFINISHED BUSINESS	
10	CLOSING CEREMONY	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Date of the next Conference • Seating order at the next Conference • Any Other Business <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Presentation of the Prize for Chart Exhibition b) Resolution expressing gratitude to the Host Country c) Statements by outgoing and incoming Directors • Closing remarks by the President of the Conference. 	

PROGRAMME

All events will take place at the Auditorium Rainier III, except when otherwise indicated.

Saturday 05 May	08:00 - 18:00	Registration of Delegates (Auditorium ground floor)	Auditorium
	09:00 - 12:30	Finance Committee Meeting	Auditorium
	14:00 - 17:30	Finance Committee Meeting (cont.) Production of Report	Auditorium
Sunday 06 May	10:00 - 18:00	Registration of Delegates (cont.)	Auditorium
	18:00 - 19:00	Meeting of Heads of Delegation	IHB
		Designation of the Conference Vice-President	IHB
		Designation of the Eligibility Committee	IHB
		Information on the Conference Programme	IHB
	19:00 - 20:00	Wine and Cheese Gathering (Heads of Delegations plus spouses)	IHB
Monday 07 May	08:00 -	Registration of Delegates (cont.)	Auditorium
	08:45 - 09:45	Conference Organization	Auditorium
		Welcoming remarks by the President of the Directing Committee	Auditorium
		Confirmation of Election of the President and Election of the Vice President of the Conference	Auditorium
		Election of the Chairman and the Vice Chairman of the Finance Committee	Auditorium
		Establishment of the Eligibility Committee	Auditorium
		Appointment of Rapporteurs	Auditorium
		Appointment of Scrutineers Team	Auditorium
		Adoption of the Agenda	Auditorium
		Approval of the Table of Tonnages	Auditorium
	10:00 - 10:45	Opening Ceremony	Auditorium
		Opening Address by the President of the Directing Committee	Auditorium
		Opening Address by the President of the Conference	Auditorium
		Opening Address by HSH Prince Albert II of Monaco	Auditorium
		Presentation of the Prince Albert 1st Medal	Auditorium
		Presentation of the Prize for IHO Chart Exhibition at the International Cartographic Conference 2005	Auditorium
		Presentation of New Member States Flags	Auditorium
	10:45 - 11:45	Opening and Visit of the Hydrographic Industry and IHO Chart Exhibitions	Auditorium
	12:00 - 12:30	Group Photograph	Casino
	12:30 - 14:00	Lunch Break	
	14:00 - 15:30	Consideration of Proposals	Auditorium
		Proposal 1 - SPWG Report Noting	Auditorium
		Proposal 2 - Approval of an Implementation Plan for the new IHO Structure	Auditorium
15:30 - 16:00	Coffee Break	Auditorium	
16:00 - 17:30	Consideration of Proposals (cont.)	Auditorium	
	Proposal 3 - Approval of the Amended IHO General Regulations	Auditorium	
	Proposal 4 - Approval of the Amended IHO Financial Regulations	Auditorium	
18:30 - 20:30	Exhibitors' Reception	Auditorium	

Tuesday 08 May	09:00 - 10:30	Consideration of Proposals (cont.)	Auditorium
		Proposal 5 - Approval of the Rules of Procedure of the IHO Assembly	Auditorium
		Proposal 6 - Approval of the Rules of Procedure of the IHO Council	Auditorium
		Proposal 7 - Approval of the Rules of Procedure of the IHO Finance Committee	Auditorium
	10:30 - 11:00	Coffee Break	Auditorium
	11:00 - 12:30	Consideration of Proposals (cont.)	Auditorium
		Proposal 8 - Approval of the Re-structuring of IHO Committees and Other Groups	Auditorium
		Proposal 9 - Advanced entry into force of the Re-Structuring of IHO Committees and other Groups	Auditorium
		Proposal 10 - Chairmanship of HSCC and IRCC Committees	Auditorium
	12:30 - 14:00	Lunch Break	
	14:00 - 15:30	Consideration of Proposals (cont.)	Auditorium
		Proposal 11 - Actions for the Implementation of Re-Structuring of the IHO Committees and other Groups	Auditorium
		Proposal 12 - Establishment of a Working Group to revise the IHO Strategic Plan	Auditorium
		Proposal 13 - Editorial Amendments to the Host Agreement	Auditorium
	15:30 - 16:00	Coffee Break	Auditorium
	16:00 - 17:30	Consideration of Proposals (cont.)	Auditorium
	Proposal 14 - Amendments to Technical Resolution T1.1	Auditorium	
	Proposal 15 - Approval of New Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure for the IHO Strategic Planning Working Group (WITHDRAWN)	Auditorium	
	Proposal 16 - Amendment to Article 6 of the General Regulations and to Rule 5 of the Rules of Procedure for IHO Conferences regarding Observers, so as to comply with EIHC 3, Decision No.5	Auditorium	
18:30 - 20:30	UK Reception (numbers limited - invitation only)	On board	
20:00 - 21:30	Saudi Arabia Reception (invitation only)	IHB	

Wednesday 09 May	09:00 - 10:30	Consideration of Proposals (cont.)	Auditorium
		Proposal 17 - Cancelling a Conference Decision	Auditorium
		Proposal 18 - Provision of Regional Staff Officers for Capacity Building Effort	Auditorium
		Proposal 19 - Establishment of a Working Group to study and propose a new edition of the IHB Staff Regulations	Auditorium
	10:30 - 11:00	Coffee Break	Auditorium
	11:00 - 12:30	Consideration of Work Programme Reports	Auditorium
		Programme 1 - Cooperation between Member States and with International Organizations	Auditorium
	12:30 - 14:00	Lunch Break	
	14:00 - 15:30	Consideration of Work Programme Reports (cont.)	Auditorium
		Programme 1 (cont)	Auditorium
	15:30 - 16:00	Coffee Break	Auditorium
	16:00 - 17:30	Consideration of Work Programme Reports (cont.)	Auditorium
		Programme 2 - Capacity Building and Technical cooperation	Auditorium
		Programme 3 - Techniques and Standards support	Auditorium
	18:30 - 20:00	Reception hosted by the Government of Monaco	Hotel de Paris

Thursday 10 May	09:00 - 10:30	Consideration of Work Programme Reports (cont.)	Auditorium
		Programme 3 (cont.) - Techniques and Standards support	Auditorium
	10:30 - 11:00	Coffee Break	Auditorium
	11:00 - 12:30	Consideration of Work Programme Reports (cont.)	Auditorium
		Programme 4 - Information Management and Public Relations	Auditorium
		Programme 5 - General Organization Development	Auditorium
	12:30 - 14:00	Lunch Break	
	14:00 - 14:30	Approval of the Proposed IHO Work Programme 2008-2012	Auditorium
	14:30 - 15:30	Finance Committee Report	Auditorium
		Presentation of the Finance Committee Report	Auditorium
		Approval of the IHO Finance Report 2002-2006	Auditorium
	15:30 - 16:00	Coffee Break	Auditorium
	16:00	Hydrographic Industry and Cartographic Exhibitions close	Auditorium
	16:00 - 17:30	Finance Committee Report (cont.)	Auditorium
		Approval of the IHO 5-year Budget 2008	Auditorium
		Appointment of the External Auditor	Auditorium
	Approval of the Report of the Finance Committee Working Group on Salary Scheme for Secretary General and Directors under the new structure of the IHO	Auditorium	
18:30 - 20:30	Candidates' Reception	IHB	

Friday 11 May	09:00 - 09:30	Report of the Eligibility Committee	Auditorium
	09:30 - 12:00	Election of Directors	Auditorium
	12:00 - 13:00	Closing Ceremony	Auditorium
		Date of the next Conference	Auditorium
		Seating order at the next Conference	Auditorium
		Any Other Business	Auditorium
		Presentation of prize for IHO Chart Exhibition	Auditorium
		Resolution expressing gratitude to the Host Country	Auditorium
		Statements by the outgoing and incoming Directors	Auditorium
		Closing remarks by the President of the Conference	Auditorium
	18:30 - 20:30	Reception offered by the President of the Conference and the IHB	IHB

**OFFICERS OF THE
XVIIth INTERNATIONAL HYDROGRAPHIC CONFERENCE**

PRESIDENT OF THE CONFERENCE Dr. Wyn WILLIAMS (United Kingdom)

VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE CONFERENCE Dr. Savithri NARAYANAN (Canada)

RAPORTEURS

**TO THE XVIIth INTERNATIONAL HYDROGRAPHIC CONFERENCE
5 - 11 May 2007**

FINANCE COMMITTEE SESSION		RAPORTEUR
FC Committee Sessions 1 & 2 <i>Saturday 5 May</i>	(AM & PM)	Ms. Christine MEYNADIER

PLENARY SESSION		RAPORTEUR
Plenary Session 1 <i>Monday 7 May</i> Opening of the Conference	(AM) (PM)	Ms. Elizabeth DUNN, UKHO Captain Mike BARRITT, UKHO
Plenary Session 2 <i>Tuesday 8 May</i>	(AM) (PM)	Captain Mike BARRITT, UKHO Mr. Keith E. ALEXANDER, USA
Plenary Session 3 <i>Wednesday 9 May</i>	(AM) (PM)	Mr. Keith E. ALEXANDER, USA Mr. Steven DEBRECHT, USA
Plenary Session 4 <i>Thursday 10 May</i>	(AM) (PM)	Mr. Steven DEBRECHT, USA Mr. Sean HINDS, CANADA
Plenary Session 5 <i>Friday 11 May</i>	(AM)	Mr. Sean HINDS, CANADA

**LIST OF EXHIBITORS AT THE
XVIIth INTERNATIONAL HYDROGRAPHIC CONFERENCE**

Company Name	Country	Stand Number
Applanix Corporation	Canada	3
ATLAS Hydrographic GmbH	Germany	11
CARIS BV	Netherlands	12
C-MAP Norway AS	Norway	22
EIVA a/s	Denmark	9
ESRI	USA	13/14
Eurocéanique	France	18
Fugro Offshore Survey	United Kingdom	27
Gardline Hydro	United Kingdom	16
GeoAcoustics Ltd	United Kingdom	21
Hydroservice AS	Norway	23
HYPACK, Inc	USA	2
IIC Technologies, Inc	USA	19
INNOMAR Technologie GmbH	Germany	32
Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC)	France	17a
IVS 3D Inc	USA	7
iXSea	France	26
Knudsen Engineering Limited	Canada	10
Kongsberg Maritime	Norway	4
L-3 Communications ELAC Nautik GmbH (Including Klein Associates Inc.)	Germany	6
Odom Hydrographic Systems, Inc	USA	5
Primar Stavanger	Norway	25
QPS bv	Netherlands	1
Reed Business - Geo bv	Netherlands	17
Reson A/S	Denmark	15
SAIC	USA	8
SevenCs AG & Co. KG	Germany	24/33
Tenix LADS Corporation	United Arab Emirates	20
T-Kartor Sweden AB	Sweden	31
TSS (International) Ltd	United Kingdom	28
UKHO	United Kingdom	29/30

OPENING ADDRESSES

OPENING ADDRESSES

1. The President of the IHB Directing Committee
Vice Admiral Alexandros MARATOS
2. The President of the XVIIth International Hydrographic Conference
Dr. Wyn WILLIAMS
3. His Serene Highness Prince Albert II of Monaco

CONF.17/MISC/01

OPENING ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE IHB DIRECTING COMMITTEE Vice Admiral Alexandros MARATOS

Your Serene Highness
Your Excellencies
Distinguished Delegates and Observers
Ladies and Gentlemen,

It is with deep emotion that we open the XVIIth International Hydrographic Conference, without the presence of His Serene Highness Prince Rainier III. The Directing Committee, the staff of the Bureau and our Member States have been deeply saddened by this loss. Today I would like to express our immense gratitude for the continuous support that His Serene Highness Prince Rainier III provided to the International Hydrographic Organization throughout his 56 year reign, thereby maintaining the Principality of Monaco as the centre of international hydrographic activity and development. He will remain in our hearts, a true friend of the International Hydrographic Organization, and we will never forget him.

Your Serene Highness, all of us present at this Opening Ceremony of the XVIIth International Hydrographic Conference are extremely privileged and grateful that you have honoured us by agreeing to officially open our Conference. You have attended past Conferences as the Hereditary Prince, but it is the first time that you will officially open our Conference as the Sovereign Prince and we trust that this will continue for many years into the future. May I, on behalf of the International Hydrographic Organization, both thank you Your Serene Highness and your Government for your interest in and support of the Organization and also to congratulate you on your personal interest and efforts in tackling the environmental issues that the world faces today. You are one of the leaders in the forefront of global initiatives for the protection of the environment especially in the Arctic. Last year in commemoration of the centenary of Prince Albert 1st expedition to the North Pole, you followed in his footsteps and in reaching the North Pole brought to the world's attention the very important observations of the area that impact not only on the climate and environment but also on navigation and safety. The Conference will have the opportunity of seeing the details of this achievement on Wednesday, when the film of the expedition will be screened. I also wish to express thanks to their Excellencies the Prime Minister, Ministers and other dignitaries of Monaco who have agreed to attend this Opening Ceremony.

On behalf of the Directing Committee, may I extend a warm welcome to the delegates from our Member States and particularly those who have only recently joined the Organization; to the observers from those countries not yet Members of the Organization; to the observers from many important International Organizations with whom we have a fruitful and mutually beneficial cooperation and of course to the representatives of the companies who, at considerable expense, have arranged exhibits of their latest products for use in hydrography, oceanography, navigation and

marine cartography. I would especially like to welcome the Ambassadors and Consuls who are here with us at this Opening Ceremony.

Ladies and Gentlemen, dear colleagues, it is customary in an opening address by the President of the Directing Committee to present the activities and achievements of the Organization. I do not intend to give a detailed report as these have been presented to Member States every year through the General and Financial Reports and will be discussed further during the coming week. I will try however to highlight some of the more significant events for the Organization that have taken place since the XVIth International Hydrographic Conference in 2002.

May I start by reporting that since the XVIth IHC in 2002 six new States have joined the Organization namely: Kuwait; Latvia; Mauritius; Myanmar; Romania and Saudi Arabia, bringing the total membership of the Organization to 78. It should also be noted that on 14 December 2006 Argentina, Brazil and Uruguay established the South West Atlantic Hydrographic Commission thereby bringing RHC coverage to all parts of the Oceans and improving the support for safety of navigation and environmental protection in the important waters of the South West Atlantic.

Undoubtedly the most important event for the Organization, during the past five years, was the 3rd Extraordinary International Hydrographic Conference which was held in 2005. The Extraordinary Conference, based on the work of the Strategic Planning Working Group, approved a Protocol of Amendments to the Convention, a new model for the structure of the Organization and a set of operational procedures designed to maintain the strengths, overcome the weaknesses and achieve the mission, vision and objectives of the Organization. Thereby the Organization will become more efficient, effective, responsive and flexible, as we move further into the 21st century in an increasingly globalized, demanding and changing technological environment. This, the XVIIth International Hydrographic Conference, has the task of finalizing this process of improving the structure of the Organization, by agreeing amendments to the General and Financial Regulations and the Rules of Procedure.

In 2003 the Organization here in Monaco, in your presence Your Serene Highness, celebrated the centenary of GEBCO, the longest lasting project in Ocean Mapping. A project initiated by Prince Albert 1st and continued today by the IHO and IOC with the support of many dedicated volunteers. As it moves into its second century the GEBCO Guiding Committee has undertaken the responsibility to study and propose developments in GEBCO so that the current and future needs of users will be better served and emerging demands for new and more accurate bathymetric products satisfied. I would like, Your Serene Highness, to thank you and your Government for the support that you provide in progressing and improving the needs of GEBCO. I would also like to thank the Nippon Foundation of Japan for making available 3,000,000 USD to educate a new generation of bathymetrists, particularly those coming from developing States, in order to support and continue GEBCO and bathymetric projects.

On 21st June 2006 we celebrated for the first time ‘World Hydrography Day’, following its recognition by the United Nations General Assembly on 29 November 2005 where, in Resolution A/60/30, under the agenda item on Oceans and the Law of the Sea, is stated “welcomes the adoption by the IHO of the World Hydrography Day, to be celebrated annually on 21 of June, with the aim of giving suitable publicity to its work at all levels and of increasing the coverage of hydrographic information on a global basis, and urges all States to work with that Organization to promote safe navigation, especially in the areas of international navigation, ports and where there are vulnerable or protected marine areas”. World Hydrography Day was celebrated by National Hydrographic Offices across the globe. Here in Monaco it was celebrated at the Bureau and we would like to thank you Your Serene Highness for your presence and your very positive speech highlighting the importance of Hydrography.

In 2003 the Organization established a Capacity Building Committee, Strategy and Fund in order to support developing States in enhancing their hydrographic capabilities and to provide training opportunities, thereby responding to one of the Strategic Issues of the Organization as approved by the 2nd Extraordinary International Hydrographic Conference in March 2000. We would like to thank the Republic of Korea for its annual donation of 100,000 USD, to be used in support of the Capacity Building activities of the Organization.

Following the tsunami disaster in the Indian Ocean on the 26 of December 2004, the IHO responded immediately to the hydrographic demands and requirements that arose. We worked closely with IMO, IALA, the States in the area, IHO Member States and the appropriate Regional Hydrographic Commissions to identify navigational, hydrographic and cartographic needs and to organize and provide support. In a special session of Member States, following the Extraordinary Conference in 2005, the matter was examined in detail and measures were adopted further defining the way in which the IHO needs to respond to maritime disasters.

During the past 5-year period many other topics of interest to the Organization have been considered: improvements in technical standards for hydrographic surveys; the development of the IHO Geospatial Standard for Hydrographic Data, S-100, to support a greater variety of hydrographic-related digital data sources, products and customers compared to the S-57 Standard; the production and provision of ENC's; the cooperation with the maritime industry; the promulgation of Maritime Safety Information, the organization of seminars concerning the application of the Law of the Sea; the preparation of a Standard Tidal Constituent List; the development of Marine Geospatial Data Infrastructures; the progress with production and delivery of the IHO Publications particularly the Manual on Hydrography; the activities of the Regional Hydrographic Commissions; and the cooperation with International Organizations. These are some of the issues that have been taken forward successfully by the Organization over the past five years and we will be considering them further this week. This week we also have to examine and approve the amendments to the General and Financial Regulations and Rules of Procedure and to approve the Work Program and Budget of the Organization for the next 5-year period 2008-2012.

Reviewing what we have achieved over the past five years and looking forward to what needs to be done, there are organizational, technical, administrative and financial issues that need to be considered. However we should all agree that there are two main issues that need urgent consideration and action: the approval of the Protocol of amendments to the Convention; and the provision of a comprehensive world wide coverage of consistent Electronic Navigational Charts. The Organization must implement the new structure that the 3rd Extraordinary Conference agreed upon as soon as possible and I urge you to accelerate your national procedures for approval. After two years only 13 Member States have approved the Protocol of Amendments as compared to the 49 that are needed and this is not good progress. The IHO must meet its obligation for assuring good world wide coverage of ENC's to support mandatory carriage requirements under SOLAS, to meet maritime demands and to protect mariners' lives at sea. To achieve this we, that is, Hydrographic Offices, Regional Hydrographic Commissions, the Bureau, RENCs and Committees must work even more closely and efficiently.

Being a member of a committee of three, over a period of five years, during which many decisions have had to be made, requires mutual understanding and the ability to appreciate the other man's point of view. I must thank my two colleagues, Admiral BARBOR and Captain GORZIGLIA, for the excellent cooperation that we have enjoyed. We have never had to resort to a vote to reach any decision. I would like also, on behalf of the Directing Committee, to express our warmest appreciation to the dedication and devotion of the Bureau's Staff. Their hard and efficient work has contributed to the success of the Organization. I would like to express our thanks to all Member States for their continuous interest, participation and contribution to the activities of the Organization and their support to the efforts and initiatives of the Directing Committee and finally to thank the representatives of International Organizations and Industry for their participation, support and contribution to the technical activities of the Organization.

Dear colleagues, ladies and gentlemen, this week we will discuss and decide on how to proceed with the important and challenging issues facing the Organization. I am sure that with your efforts and contribution we will make both appropriate and necessary decisions and approve actions so that the Organization can respond in the best possible way to the demands and challenges that we are facing.

CONF.17/MISC/2

**OPENING ADDRESS BY THE CONFERENCE PRESIDENT
Dr. Wyn WILLIAMS, CB, United Kingdom**

Your Serene Highness,
Your Excellencies,
Distinguished delegates and observers,
Ladies and gentlemen,

I am honoured and delighted to address you in the Opening Ceremony of this Conference for a whole host of reasons. I beg you will indulge me the time to enumerate four of those reasons.

My first reason is that this Ceremony is one of the highlights of the Conference, and that, of course, is because of the presence of Your Serene Highness - for which we are deeply honoured and grateful. On behalf of all the Member States in the International Hydrographic Organization, may I extend our very respectful thanks to you for your attendance this morning and for the help and support which you have so liberally provided to this Organization, which continues the wonderful assistance and encouragement which your late father, His Serene Highness Prince Rainier III, gave to us throughout his reign. Because of him, and you, Your Highness, not just in the coming week, but throughout the year and every year, Monaco is recognized as the centre of the hydrographic world. We, the delegates of the participating nations, are delighted to be associated with this centre, to be in this City, and to enjoy the wonderful scenery, facilities and entertainment which your Principality provides.

I am also delighted to have this opportunity, because this will be the first time that the United Kingdom has provided the Conference President for 25 years. The UK is pleased that Member States have given us this honour and we accept it humbly as a recognition that our nation, and in particular the UK Hydrographic Office, has done its best to contribute to, assist in, and occasionally lead, the work of the IHO in making the seas and oceans a safer place for the people, ships and cargoes who sail on them, and making them an environment which is sustainable and explorable. The UK continues to work towards improving the safety of life at sea, a goal that may just become a little nearer with a more rapid take-up of the new technologies, products and services which we in the UK and all the States here are developing.

The third reason is to demonstrate to you all that there is indeed life beyond retirement! And to reassure all you workaholics that “life beyond retirement” is in fact rather enjoyable – you just have to get over the slight feeling of guilt about it! Nine months ago, when I left my job as Chief Executive of the UKHO and UK National Hydrographer, my sorrow at leaving was balanced by an undeserved feeling of esteem that I was in fact to be replaced by two people, and pleasure that I would have this opportunity of keeping in touch with you all.

The fourth reason for my pleasure in being here today is simply that this Conference is important, and is the culmination of years of effort by all the Member States, working through the Strategic Planning Working Group, in examining and reflecting on what sort of International Organization the Hydrographic world will need in the future. As the President of the IHB has reported, the Extraordinary

Conference in 2005 approved a Protocol of Amendments to our Convention, a new model for the structure of the Organization, and a set of operational procedures designed to set us on a path of being more efficient, effective, responsive and flexible – in order to help us to realise our mission, vision and objectives. This, the Seventeenthth International Hydrographic Conference, has the task of setting the seal on this process of addressing our future, by agreeing amendments to the General and Financial Regulations and the Rules of Procedure. I believe we can - and we will - reach agreements on all the issues before us. We have agreed that changes are necessary for the future well-being of the IHO, so I join with the President of the IHB in asking all delegates to work hard at home to accelerate their national procedures for approval of these changes.

This Conference is important also in reminding ourselves that our organisational changes are because we are in the midst of rapid technological and commercial changes. Changes in the way we collect data, evaluate and store the data, disseminate and display them. Whilst we know that paper navigation charts and publications will be with us for many years to come, the “centre of gravity” of marine transport is rapidly shifting towards digital navigation. That shift has large commercial drivers, a somewhat purposeful blurring of the differences between official and unofficial data, and in the user community a sense of frustration at our apparent slowness to respond. That shift will receive added impetus when the use of ECDISs and ENC's becomes mandated in some areas for some vessels.

In the debate this Conference will have on the progress of ENC coverage and WEND matters, we must have at the forefront of our minds our responsibility to those we exist to serve – mariners at sea. Therefore we must seek rapid, tangible progress in delivering a credible, official, seamless, integrated digital vector service for the SOLAS market on major global routes. That's something I regarded as the single most important issue during my time as UK Hydrographer, and I know that my successors and others here feel and felt the same. We have no time and no need for politics or rivalry. All the objectives of the WEND can be achieved, and achieved rapidly, if we work in partnership with each other. Thankfully, the history of the IHO is one of successful cooperation, and I am confident that that will continue.

So much for my pleasure in being here. The time has come for us all to have the pleasure of being addressed by His Serene Highness Prince Albert II.

Your Serene Highness, it is my honour to ask you to open the Seventeenth International Hydrographic Conference.

Thank you.

OPENING ADDRESS BY H.S.H. PRINCE ALBERT II OF MONACO

Mr. President,
Directors, Heads of Delegation and Delegates,

It is a great pleasure for me to welcome you on the occasion of the XVIIth International Hydrographic Conference.

As the work sessions are about to start, I feel a particular sense of pride particularly as the ties between Monaco and hydrography, as you know, go back a long way. Indeed, these ties date back to my great-great-grandfather, Prince Albert Ist, who, in his time, successfully worked to establish the International Hydrographic Bureau, which was to become the International Hydrographic Organization.

Since that time the Organization, which counts 78 Member States, has not ceased to expand, and is now widely recognized internationally which is reflected by the status granted to it by the United Nations.

In effect, the exceptional growth of your Organization led you to adopt an ambitious Strategic Plan at the Extraordinary Conference which convened here in 2005. At that Conference you decided to initiate the procedure to amend the Convention on the International Hydrographic Organization and my Government has followed up this matter with the relevant authorities in your various countries, through the appropriate diplomatic channels.

Thus the modernization process initiated two years ago is still ongoing and it is up to you at this conference to pursue the process in order to improve the administrative, financial and technical rules which govern the Organization.

However, I would like to take this opportunity to evoke the very purpose of the science of hydrography.

This science has remained true to its primary vocation which is to contribute to protecting human life at sea and, and, more generally, to making navigation safe.

The efforts which you make in this domain to continuously improve the quality and accuracy of nautical charts must be commended.

The success achieved is due to the efficiency of the coordinated efforts of the national hydrographic services and your Organization. But I would also like to mention the essential intermediary role of the Regional Hydrographic Commissions. With the recent creation of the South West Atlantic Hydrographic Commission, the Commissions now cover all parts of the oceans and I can only express my utmost satisfaction.

By using all the means offered by modern technology, you have continued to seek excellence in order to take up the challenge of providing safety at sea. Maritime accidents and the dramatic consequences resulting from them, whether it be the life of the mariners or the environment, unfortunately remind us all too often of the stakes at risk.

The natural partner of oceanography, hydrography is also a fundamental vector for the knowledge of the sea.

You cannot therefore ignore the changes which are affecting our planet which have an impact on the marine environment. Following the tsunami in 2004 which seriously devastated a part of the Asian continent, you had to assess the consequences in your domain.

You also know how important environmental issues are to me in general and in particular those concerning the seas and oceans. For that reason, I wanted to go to the Arctic to see for myself the effects of climatic change. Hydrography, without a doubt, enables us to measure and assess, with the utmost accuracy, the extent of this alarming phenomenon which our generation must tackle without delay.

This is why your science should be better known to the public at large and I am very pleased with the creation of the World Hydrography Day, the importance of which, I believe, must be underlined.

In conclusion, I hereby declare the XVIIth International Hydrographic Conference open and wish you very fruitful working sessions.

Thank you.

PROPOSALS

LIST OF CONFERENCE PROPOSALS

PRO No.	WORK PROGRAMME	NAME OF PROPOSAL	SUBMITTED BY	Page
1	5	SPWG Report Noting	SPWG	37
2	5	Approval of an Implementation Plan for the new IHO Structure	SPWG	39
3	5	Approval of the amended IHO General Regulations	SPWG	42
4	5	Approval of the amended IHO Financial Regulations	SPWG	48
5	5	Approval of the Rules of Procedure of the IHO Assembly	SPWG	49
6	5	Approval of the Rules of Procedure of the IHO Council	SPWG	51
7	5	Approval of the Rules of Procedure of the IHO Finance Committee	SPWG	53
8	5	Approval of the Re-structuring of IHO Committees and other Groups	SPWG	55
9	5	Advanced Entry into force of the re-structuring of IHO Committees and other Groups	SPWG	57
10	5	Chairmanship of HSSC and IRCC Committees	SPWG	58
11	5	Actions for the Implementation of re-structuring of the IHO Committees and other Groups	SPWG	59
12	5	Establishment of a Working Group to revise the IHO Strategic Plan	SPWG	60
13	5	Editorial Amendments to the Host Agreement	SPWG	63
14	5	Amendments to Technical Resolution T1.1	SPWG	64
15	5	Approval of new Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure for the IHO SPWG	Australia <i>(withdrawn)</i>	67
16	5	Amendments to Article 6 of the General Regulations, and to Rule 5 of the Rules of Procedure for IHO Conferences regarding Observers, so as to comply with EIHC 3, Decision No. 5	Germany	71
17	5	Canceling a Conference Decision	Spain	74
18	2	Provision of Regional Staff Officers for Capacity Building Effort	UK	77
19	5	Establishment of a Working Group to Study and Propose a New Edition of the IHB Staff Regulations.	IHB	80

PRO No.	WORK PROGRAMME	NAME OF PROPOSAL	SUBMITTED BY	Page
20	3	Establishment of a Working Group on Hydrography and Cartography of Inland Waters.	Argentina	83
21	3	A Resolution on ENC Coverage in relation to ECDIS Carriage Requirements	Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden	85
22	3	Establishment of a Working Group on Marine Spatial Data Infrastructure Development	United Kingdom and Germany	88
23	3	A Resolution on Electronic Navigational Chart Coverage, Availability Consistency and Quality	Japan Germany and South Africa	90
24		Resolution inviting contracting Parties to consider the entry into force of the Protocol of Amendments to the Convention as a matter of priority	Germany, Norway, Denmark and Sweden	91

PRO 1 – SPWG REPORT NOTING

Submitted by: The Strategic Planning Working Group

Reference: “Report of the IHO SPWG 2005-2006” (CONF.17/DOC.1)

The Conference is requested to note the “Report of the IHO SPWG 2005-2006”

MEMBER STATES' COMMENTS

CROATIA

Croatia supports this proposal.

Croatia fully accepts the SPWG Report, thanking the Chairman, all SPWG members, RHC delegates, and SPWG Legal Experts for putting in a lot of effort and time to prepare documents and proposals of vital importance for the future work of the International Hydrographic Organisation.

FINLAND

Finland supports the proposal submitted by the SPWG.

FRANCE

The comments concerning Annexes I and L are provided under Proposals 8 and 12 respectively.

GREECE

Greece supports this proposal.

NORWAY

Norway supports this proposal.

UNITED KINGDOM

UK supports the proposals.

USA

The U.S. participated in all sessions of the SPWG and notes the report.

With regard to Section 8, the U.S. agrees that the work of the SPWG has been completed and that SPWG should be terminated as a working group.

With regard to Annex H, the U.S. would prefer that the HSSC and IRCC be titled “Hydrographic Services and Standards Group” and “Inter-Regional Coordination Group” such that the proposed Sub-Committees could continue as “Committees” which would allow those Committees to retain Sub-Committees, e.g., GEBCO Sub-Committees.

Annex L, 2.b. should include “navigable rivers and large lakes” for inclusion when amending general information.

Concerning “hydrographic interest” and membership on Council, the U.S. can agree with Tonnage in the first instance, but the U.S. is open to revision of the criterion provided it is not complex. The U.S. supports revisiting the subject by the second Assembly as cited in the Executive Summary of the SPWG Report.

PRO 2 - APPROVAL OF AN IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FOR THE NEW IHO STRUCTURE

Submitted by: The Strategic Planning Working Group

The Conference is requested to agree with the implementation plan laid down below:

Definition: DoA (Date of Approval) is the date that two-thirds of the Member States have approved the amendments to the Convention in accordance with paragraph 3 of Article XXI of the Convention.

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FOR NEW IHO STRUCTURE

1. *Transition from Conference to Assembly*

- i) *The planning for EIHCs should schedule them two years after an IHC. The future dates of IHCs and EIHCs should thus be 2007, 2009, 2012, 2014, etc*
- ii) *If the DoA is more than 3 months before a Conference (whether an IHC or EIHC), then this Conference will become the 1st Assembly.*
- iii) *If the DoA is less than 3 months before a Conference, the 1st Assembly will be the next Conference (EIHC or IHC) scheduled after the one to be held within the immediate three month period. In this case, the Conference will initiate the selection of Council members and mandate the IHB/Secretariat to carry out the selection procedures through Circular Letter.*

2. *Establishment of the Council*

Two-thirds of the seats on Council will be allocated for regional representation; the remaining one-third of the seats will be based on hydrographic interest.

Member States not affiliated to a Regional Hydrographic Commission

To facilitate the full and fair representation of the interests of each IHO Member State, it is important that each Member State is a member of an RHC. The SPWG encourages all Member States to establish or join Regional Hydrographic Commissions. At present, two MS are not in an RHC.

3. *Transition of the International Hydrographic Bureau (IHB) to the Secretariat*

During the period between the DoA and a date three months after the 1st Assembly the IHB shall have the authority required and shall adopt such measures as may be necessary for transition of the IHB to the Secretariat

MEMBER STATES' COMMENTS

CROATIA

Croatia supports this proposal.

FINLAND

Finland supports the proposal submitted by the SPWG.

FRANCE

Point 1

France has no objection to the planning proposed for the ordinary and extraordinary sessions of the Conference under the present structure, but nevertheless notes that in the current Convention the holding of extraordinary sessions of the conference is subject to approval by the majority of the Member States (Article VI.1). France therefore suggests that this clause be strictly followed by seeking approval at the close of the previous ordinary session, and so, in this particular case, at the close of the XVIIth IHC. On the other hand, this does not prevent an extraordinary session from being convened at a different date from those proposed in the implementation plan, if unforeseen circumstances justify it.

Point 2

Point 2 is subject to the adoption of the draft General Regulations (Article 17 – see PRO 3). To date, only zone INT C1 is not yet covered by a regional hydrographic commission. France reiterates that, in order to improve the Organization's effectiveness, it would prefer that the geographical areas covered by the RHC coincide with the INT chart regions (cf Technical Resolution T1.3- Article 3) and suggests that, if the relevant task in the 2006 Work Programme (item O 1.1.1) has not been successfully completed by then, the Conference should invite the IHB to bring together those Member States concerned to encourage the creation of a Regional Hydrographic Commission covering the INT Chart Zone C1 as soon as possible.

GREECE

Greece supports this proposal.

NORWAY

Norway supports this proposal.

UNITED KINGDOM

UK supports the proposals.

USA

The U.S. supports the implementation plan, but desires that IHO find a way for all Member States to have an opportunity for participation in Council. It is inappropriate for the Organization to adopt a system that excludes any Member State in good standing.

NOTE BY IHB

At the date of publishing the "Red Book", all IHO Member States are in a Regional Hydrographic Commission. The South West Atlantic Hydrographic Commission (SWAtHC) was established on 14 December 2006.

PRO 3 - APPROVAL OF THE AMENDED IHO GENERAL REGULATIONS

Submitted by: The Strategic Planning Working Group

Reference: “General Regulations of the IHO” (CONF.17/DOC.2)

PROPOSAL

The Conference is requested to approve the text of the “IHO General Regulations”, The implementation of these Regulations will be subject to the entry into force of the amendments to the IHO Convention”.

MEMBER STATES' COMMENTS

AUSTRALIA

This comment should be read in conjunction with Australia’s comment on PRO 8 regarding renaming the Hydrographic Committee on Antarctica (HCA) as the Hydrographic Commission on Antarctica (HCA).

The existence of Regional Hydrographic Commissions (RHCs) is recognized in the revised General Regulations, where their purpose and methods of operation are defined in general terms. However, there is no similar provision for the HCA in the revised General Regulations. Such a reference is desirable to formally acknowledge the continued existence of this important body that will be placed under the Inter Regional Coordination Committee (IRCC).

RHCs were recognized by Decision 1 of the XVth IHC that resulted in Administrative Resolution T1.3. The HCA was established by Decision 4 of the same Conference. The statutes of the HCA state that *the Committee is established in conformity with Administrative Resolution T1.3 of the IHO - Establishment of Regional Hydrographic Commissions (RHC)*. Resolution T1.3 has been used to form the basis of Article 9 of the revised General Regulations.

While the HCA has similar characteristics to an RHC, it cannot operate under Article 9 of the revised General Regulations because membership is not open to all IHO Member States. In particular, membership requires certain and particular qualifications to be met. These are that while members must be IHO Member States, they must also have acceded to the Antarctic Treaty and are contributing resources and/or data to IHO INT Chart coverage of Region M.

As well as Antarctica, there may also be other regions that in the future will merit the establishment of Special Hydrographic Commissions, similar to the HCA. Like the HCA, these commissions would coordinate and promote hydrographic activities in areas not ordinarily covered by an RHC. As the amended Convention of the IHO does not preclude hydrography of rivers, inland seas or lakes, it is possible that in the future Special Hydrographic Commissions might be established to cover areas such as inland continental lakes and seas, or major river systems with significant access and dependence on sea-going traffic and trade.

In order to properly recognize the HCA and also to allow for other Special Hydrographic Commissions that may be established in the future, an additional Article may be necessary in the General Regulations. The following draft draws upon the existing statutes of the HCA and the proposed Article 9 of the revised General Regulations to form the basis for such an Article.

Special Hydrographic Commissions

ARTICLE 9 (bis)

- a) Special Hydrographic Commissions (SHCs), such as the Hydrographic Commission on Antarctica, are bodies established by Member States and recognized by the Assembly to enhance the exchange of information and promote and coordinate hydrographic surveying and nautical charting matters in regions not covered by a Regional Hydrographic Commission.
- b) SHCs shall be established by an agreement of their members.
- c) Membership of an SHC may include full members and associate members, both willing to contribute to the objectives of the Organization in the relevant region.
- d) Full membership is reserved for Member States who have recognized rights in the relevant region and who are contributing resources and/or data to IHO INT Chart coverage or similar charting mechanisms in that region, and which become signatories to the Statutes of the SHC.
- e) Associate Membership is open to any non-IHO Member State whose government has recognized rights in the relevant region and who are contributing resources and/or data to IHO INT Chart coverage or similar charting mechanisms in that region, and which becomes a signatory to the Statutes of the SHC.
- f) Observer status in an SHC is open to any other IHO Member State, to the representatives of any national or international organization, and to individual experts, having professional involvement in hydrographic surveying or nautical charting in the relevant region either by contributing to those activities, or by providing support to those activities, or as users of derived products.

If the HCA is established under the IRCC prior to the revised General Regulations entering into force, it may also be necessary for the existent General Regulations to be amended to recognize the existence and status of SHC's, including the HCA, in the interim.

BRAZIL

Brazil has participated in the SPWG works, agreeing to the final report. However, considers that the Article 17 c) text is not the best expression for the definition of the hydrographic interest. Brazil believes that there are objective and measurable elements, which may express all Member States expectations. Being thus, the Brazilian opinion is that this subject must remain in study by the future work group to be argued in Proposal 12.

CROATIA

Croatia supports this proposal.

FINLAND

Finland supports the proposal submitted by the SPWG.

FRANCE

France approves the draft, subject to the editorial remarks concerning the French version and the following remarks on the content :

General Comment

The numbering of the paragraphs must be aligned with that adopted for the Convention [i.e. (a), (b), (i), (ii) etc.] an instead of a), b) etc. I) ii), etc.

ARTICLE 17

A Member State may decide not to apply for selection by the regional hydrographic commission (or one of the regional hydrographic commissions) of which it is a member, because for instance, its seat is secured based on “hydrographic interests criteria”. The Member State has nevertheless the right that its “weight” be considered in the RHC or in one (and only one) of the RHC, of which it is a member. The proposed wording does not clearly reflect how the MS will be accounted for in the calculation of the number of seats allocated to each RHC. In order to avoid any ambiguity, France suggests replacing paragraphs 17 (b) (i) to 17 (b) (vii) by the following text, which make a distinction between the concepts of eligibility on the one hand and application for selection, on the other:

- (i) a Member State which is a full member of only one RHC is eligible as a Member of this Commission;
- (ii) a Member State which is a full member of several RHC must select the RHC to which it will apply for selection, copying its application to the Secretary General at least 6 months before an ordinary session of the Assembly;
- (iii) a Member State can only apply to the RHC through which it is eligible; if it applies to this RHC for selection, it must inform the Secretary General at least 6 months before an ordinary session of the Assembly;
- (iv) the number of seats allocated to each RHC shall be calculated by the Secretary General on the basis of the number of Member States eligible for selection from each RHC, based on the principle of proportional distribution in order to arrive at the required two-thirds of Council seats provided for in this sub-paragraph b);
- (v) for the purpose of deciding how many Council seats are allocated to each RHC the Secretary-General shall ensure that every Member State is counted as a full Member of one, but not more than one, RHC;
- (vi) each RHC shall declare to the Secretary General, before the last day of each ordinary session of the Assembly, the Member State(s) it has selected to take seats on the Council from among those eligible for selection.

GERMANY

Article 7 describes the possibility of establishing a working group of legal experts. No reason can be seen as to why establishing such a legal working group needs to be expressly covered by an Article of its own while everything on establishing working groups is regulated in general under Article 6.

Germany proposes to delete Article 7 altogether, and to renumber the remaining Articles.

GREECE

Greece supports this proposal.

JAPAN

ARTICLE 11

The items b) and c) of the Article 11 of the General Regulations are the same phrase in the Convention and they should be omitted.

NORWAY

Norway supports this proposal.

UNITED KINGDOM

UK supports the proposals.

USA

ARTICLE 7

Should be revised to read, “When legal advice is sought on matters relating to the interpretation and application of the IHO Convention, the Financial Regulations, the General Regulations, the Rules of Procedure of the Assembly, the Council or the Finance Committee or the execution of the work programme of the Organization, a working group of legal experts drawn from all Member States shall be established by the Assembly or by Member States through correspondence.” As currently worded, formation of a working group is optional when seeking legal advice, which was not the intent of the U.S. proposal at the SPWG meeting in the Republic of Korea.

ARTICLE 9

Should be revised to simplify the participation of Member States in Regional Hydrographic Commissions. With RHCs becoming bodies of the Organization, the rules for accession of new members to RHCs could be simplified much as the Organization is doing for joining IHO. The U.S. believes Article 9 (e) “Full membership is reserved for Member States within the region.” should be revised by addition of a sentence that reads, “To foster coordination among Member States, all

Member States in good standing with territory within the boundaries of an RHC may participate as Full Members of the RHC.”

ARTICLE 17

(b) (iii) states:

“a Member State must apply to the RHC for selection, copying its application to the Secretary-General, at least six months before an ordinary session of the Assembly;”

This would imply that the RHC has convened and has made a selection for their candidate(s) to serve on the Council at least six months prior to the Assembly.

However,

(b) (vi) states:

“three months before the ordinary session of the Assembly, the Secretary-General shall inform all Member States of the number of seats allocated to each RHC and those Member States eligible for selection by each RHC;”

This means that, according to paragraph iii, the RHCs must decide their representative(s) to the Secretary-General before they are actually informed as to how many seats they will be allocated. This would almost certainly require the RHCs to convene a meeting to select their Council Representative(s) within the three months prior to an Assembly.

RHCs need to know how many seats they will be allocated before the MS can make their intentions to be nominated known. That will require the Secretary-General to provide the Council seat allocations much earlier. We do not think the Secretary-General needs to know if an RHC intends to use its allocation; we believe it is safe to assume that any RHC will use any seats allocated to it. Additionally, some RHCs may not even meet in the year prior to an Assembly.

Since council members are essentially to serve a three-year term and thus the allocated number for each RHC will be in place for that period. It would seem that this number would be a fairly stable figure; it is not clear why the Secretary-General cannot inform Member States of the number of seats allocated to each RHC at a significantly earlier date. Earlier notification would allow RHCs to schedule a meeting at a time not so close to the Assembly dates to make their selection(s) for this important position. In fact, it is not clear why the Secretary-General could not make this announcement at the end of the prior Assembly.

This could be accommodated by revising :

ARTICLE 17

(b) (vi) to read:

“At the end of each Assembly, the Secretary-General shall inform all Member States of the number of seats allocated to each RHC for the following term and those Member States eligible for selection by each RHC;”

- vii provides that an RHC must agree to its selections for Council during the Assembly. This could prove difficult, if Member States of the RHC desiring a seat exceed the allocation. If the procedure remains as proposed, the U.S. believes that there needs to be an established procedure in case of non-agreement within an RHC. The following sentence should be added:

“If selection is not agreed within an RHC, selection from amongst the candidate Member States will be determined by lot drawing of the names.”

ARTICLE 21

b)

minor revision as follows: “...and by a senior representative of the nominating Member State.”

PRO 4 - APPROVAL OF THE AMENDED IHO FINANCIAL REGULATIONS

Submitted by: The Strategic Planning Working Group

Reference: “Financial Regulations of the IHO” (CONF.17/DOC.3)

PROPOSAL

The Conference is requested to approve the text of the “IHO Financial Regulations”. The implementation of these Regulations will be subject to the entry into force of the amendments to the IHO Convention”.

MEMBER STATES' COMMENTS

CROATIA

Croatia supports this proposal.

FINLAND

Finland supports the proposal submitted by the SPWG.

FRANCE

France approves the draft subject to the editorial remarks concerning the French version.

GREECE

Greece supports this proposal.

NORWAY

Norway supports this proposal.

UNITED KINGDOM

UK supports the proposals.

PRO 5 - APPROVAL OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE IHO ASSEMBLY

Submitted by: The Strategic Planning Working Group

Reference: “Rules of Procedure for the IHO Assembly” (CONF.17/DOC.4)

PROPOSAL

The Conference is requested to approve the text of the “Rules of Procedure for the IHO Assembly”. The implementation of these Rules of Procedure will be subject to the entry into force of the amendments to the IHO Convention”.

MEMBER STATES' COMMENTS

CROATIA

Croatia supports this proposal.

FINLAND

Finland supports the proposal submitted by the SPWG.

FRANCE

France approves the draft subject to the editorial remarks concerning the French version.

GERMANY

RULE 8, RULE 9

These rules define the conditions for “public attendance”, admitting individuals to attend sessions of the Assembly with the consent of the Assembly.

Germany is strictly opposed to giving individuals, who are neither members of a national delegation nor observers in accordance with Rules 5 and 6, any formal role in the Assembly. The attendance of who may be invited to any of the organs or subsidiary organs of IHO is clearly regulated under Article 4 of the General Regulations, and they do not include any other kind of attendance. The inclusion of “public attendance “ in the Rules of Procedure of the IHO Assembly appears, therefore, unconstitutional and would only open up additional questions as to which rights such an individual might have, e.g. right to comment on any agenda item.

If anybody is allowed to participate in the sessions of the Assembly, it should be through a national delegation or accredited observer organization, or through a function within the IHB, e.g. as advisor.

Germany requests to delete Rules 8 and 9.

GREECE

Greece supports this proposal.

JAPAN

Invitation to observers

RULE 5

The provision “Observers shall receive copies of all documents” should be revised to :

“Observers may receive documents not classified as confidential”.

NORWAY

Norway supports this proposal.

UNITED KINGDOM

UK supports the proposals.

PRO 6 - APPROVAL OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE IHO COUNCIL

Submitted by: The Strategic Planning Working Group

Reference: "Rules of Procedure for the IHO Council" (CONF.17/DOC.5)

PROPOSAL

The Conference is requested to approve the text of the "Rules of Procedure for the IHO Council". The implementation of these Rules of Procedure will be subject to the entry into force of the amendments to the IHO Convention".

MEMBER STATES' COMMENTS

CROATIA

Croatia supports this proposal.

FINLAND

Finland supports the proposal submitted by the SPWG.

FRANCE

France approves the draft subject to the editorial remarks concerning the French version.

GERMANY

This rule allows individuals to attend sessions of the Council with the consent of the Council.

Germany is strictly opposed giving individuals who are neither members of a national delegation nor observers in accordance with Rules 4 and 5 any formal role in the Council. The attendance of who may be invited to any of the organs or subsidiary organs of IHO is clearly regulated under Article 4 of the General Regulations, and they do not include any other kind of attendance. The inclusion of "public attendance" in the Rules of Procedure of the IHO Council appears, therefore, unconstitutional and would only open up additional questions as to which rights such an individual might have, e.g. right to comment on any agenda item.

If anybody is allowed to participate in the sessions of the Council, it should be through a national delegation or accredited observer organization, or through a function within the IHB, e.g. as advisor.

Germany requests to delete Rule 7.

GREECE

Greece supports this proposal.

JAPAN

Invitation to observers

RULE 4

The provision “Observers shall receive copies of all documents” should be revised to :

“Observers may receive documents not classified as confidential”.

NORWAY

Norway supports this proposal.

UNITED KINGDOM

UK supports the proposals.

PRO 7 - APPROVAL OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE IHO FINANCE COMMITTEE

Submitted by: The Strategic Planning Working Group

Reference: “Rules of Procedure for the IHO Finance Committee” (CONF.17/DOC.6)

PROPOSAL

The Conference is requested to approve the text of the “Rules of Procedure for the IHO Finance Committee”. The implementation of these Rules of Procedure will be subject to the entry into force of the amendments to the IHO Convention.

MEMBER STATES' COMMENTS

CROATIA

Croatia supports this proposal.

FINLAND

Finland supports the proposal submitted by the SPWG.

FRANCE

France approves the draft subject to the editorial remarks on the French version.

GREECE

Greece supports this proposal.

JAPAN

Invitation to observers

RULE 4

The provision “Observers shall receive copies of all documents” should be revised to :

“Observers may receive documents not classified as confidential”.

NORWAY

Norway supports this proposal.

UNITED KINGDOM

UK supports the proposals.

PRO 8 - APPROVAL OF THE RE-STRUCTURING OF IHO COMMITTEES AND OTHER GROUPS

Submitted by: The Strategic Planning Working Group

Reference: “Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure of HSSC and IRCC”. “Report of the IHO SPWG 2005-2006” (CONF.17/DOC.1 Annex “I”)

The Conference is requested to approve the establishment of the IHO “HSSC “and “IRCC” in accordance with the Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure laid down in the Reference Conference Document.

EXPLANATORY NOTE

The SPWG concluded that the migration of existing subsidiary bodies into a structure of two main committees with subordinate bodies could be progressed ahead of Convention ratification. The Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure submitted were prepared by the CBC and CHRIS Chairmen and endorsed by the SPWG.

MEMBER STATES' COMMENTS**AUSTRALIA**

Rather than renaming the Hydrographic Committee on Antarctica (HCA) to become the *Hydrographic Sub Committee on Antarctica (HSCA)* it may be preferable to adopt the title *Hydrographic Commission on Antarctica (HCA)*. This would avoid a change to the well-known and established abbreviated title for this body. It could continue to be known as the HCA.

Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure have not been provided for the Sub-committee level bodies dealing with Antarctica and GEBCO. They have been provided for all the other major subordinate bodies of the HSSC and the IRCC. Australia has commented under PRO 3 that the Hydrographic Commission on Antarctica should continue to be governed under its own statutes. If this is agreed by the 17th IHC, ToRs and RoPs are not required for this body. ToRs and RoPs are still required for GEBCO in any case.

CROATIA

Croatia supports this proposal.

FINLAND

Finland supports the proposal submitted by the SPWG.

In addition, Finland has the following detailed comment:

The coordination of the work of the Sub-Committees and Working Groups of the HSSC Committee should be taken care when developing in more details the structure and work of the HSSC, its Sub-Committees and Working Groups.

FRANCE

The proposed texts call for the following remarks:

- The identification of the changes to be made after the new structure is in place should be standardized in all the texts concerning each committee and between the two committees, both in the English version as well as the French (e.g. different wording in the two preambles of both Terms of Reference; numbering and order of articles, distinction between the ordinary sessions of the Assembly and Council meetings, etc.

GREECE

Greece supports this proposal.

JAPAN

- ABLOS is the board which is established in order to perform an important function as referred to in UNCLOS. It should be subsidized by the Council not any other subsidiary organs.
- GEBCO should be fully respected for its considerable history and outcome. It should not be subsidized by any subsidiary organs.

NORWAY

Norway supports this proposal.

UNITED KINGDOM

UK supports the proposals.

USA

See PRO 1 above on naming.

PRO 9 – ADVANCED ENTRY INTO FORCE OF THE RE-STRUCTURING OF IHO COMMITTEES AND OTHER GROUPS

Submitted by: The Strategic Planning Working Group

Reference: “Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure of HSSC and IRCC”. “Report of the IHO SPWG 2005-2006” (CONF.17/DOC.1 Annex “I”)

The Conference is requested to approve the date of 1st January 2009 at the latest for the entry into force of the re-structuring of the IHO Committees and other Groups, as proposed by the SPWG.

EXPLANATORY NOTE

The SPWG believes that an early implementation of the proposed new structure for the IHO Committees and other Groups does not contravene the Convention and is important for improving the efficiency and effectiveness of the Organization and proposes that the date of commencement of the new structure be 1st January 2009.

MEMBER STATES' COMMENTS

CROATIA

Croatia supports this proposal.

FINLAND

Finland supports the proposal submitted by the SPWG.

FRANCE

France recommends some flexibility and suggests the Directing Committee to consider, in liaison with the Chairmen of CHRIS and CBC, the setting up of a transition plan so that the new structure will be in place by 1st January 2009 **at the latest** (cf. SPWG report, SPWG Proposal 12 under para. 9).

GREECE

Greece supports this proposal.

NORWAY

Norway supports this proposal.

UNITED KINGDOM

UK supports the proposals.

PRO 10 – CHAIRMANSHIP OF HSSC AND IRCC COMMITTEES

Submitted by: The Strategic Planning Working Group

The Conference is requested to agree that on 1 January 2009 at the latest the Chairman of the existing CHRIS assumes the role of HSSC Chair, and the Chairman of the existing CBC assumes the role of IRCC Chair, until the new Chairs are elected by the Committees.

MEMBER STATES' COMMENTS

CROATIA

Croatia supports this proposal.

FINLAND

Finland supports the proposal submitted by the SPWG.

FRANCE

France approves this proposal, subject to its comment on Proposal 9 concerning the date of entry into force.

GREECE

Greece supports this proposal.

NORWAY

Norway supports this proposal.

UNITED KINGDOM

UK supports the proposals.

PRO 11 - ACTIONS FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF RE-STRUCTURING OF THE IHO COMMITTEES AND OTHER GROUPS

Submitted by: The Strategic Planning Working Group

The Conference is requested to agree that the IHB, in consultation with the Chairmen of CHRIS and CBC, will take the appropriate actions for the implementation of the re-structuring of the IHO Committees and other Groups no later than 1st January 2009.

MEMBER STATES' COMMENTS

CROATIA

Croatia supports this proposal.

FINLAND

Finland supports the proposal submitted by the SPWG.

FRANCE

France approves this proposal, subject to its comment on Proposal 9 concerning the planned date.

GREECE

Greece supports this proposal.

NORWAY

Norway supports this proposal.

UNITED KINGDOM

UK supports the proposals.

PRO 12 - ESTABLISHMENT OF A WORKING GROUP TO REVISE THE IHO STRATEGIC PLAN

Submitted by: The Strategic Planning Working Group

Reference: “Consideration of the Status and Progress of the Strategic Plan and Work Programme”, “Report of the IHO SPWG 2005-2006” (Annex “L” to CONF.17/DOC.1)

The Conference is requested to establish a working group to revise the IHO’s Strategic Plan, based on the following comments.

WORKING GROUP TO DEVELOP IHO STRATEGIC PLAN

Proposed Name

IHO Strategic Plan Working Group (ISPWG)

Terms of Reference

Review the existing IHO Strategic Plan in view of IHO’s new Vision, Mission and Objectives.

Prepare a revised draft strategic plan.

Present the draft Strategic Plan and any related recommendations to the Member States no later than 1 January 2009.

Composition

The Working Group will comprise representatives designated by the Regional Hydrographic Commissions. Individual Member States may be represented if they consider it necessary. The IHB shall be represented in the Working Group.

Chair

Chair and Vice Chair shall be elected by the Conference.

Working Method

The Working Group shall encourage maximum participation by working mainly by correspondence, using information technology, and with no more than two face-to-face meetings of the full membership.

EXPLANATORY NOTE

The SPWG examined the Strategic Plan that was approved during the 2nd EIHC in April 2000 and concluded that it needs a thorough revision. The definition of Hydrography, the IHO mission to include “safety, environmental protection and security”, the use of hydrographic data and information for purposes other than navigation, “challenges for IHO” like producing a comprehensive coverage of ENC’s, the new developments for Capacity Building, the active engagements of the various stakeholders to support the technical work programme of the Organization, the reference to the relevant UN/GA resolutions regarding the IHO, are some of the issues that need to be considered in improving the Strategic Plan.

The Working Group working in close cooperation with the Bureau will present the revised Strategic Plan for approval in the next EIHC in 2009.

MEMBER STATES' COMMENTS

AUSTRALIA

Australia's comments on this PRO 12 should be read in conjunction with our comments on PRO 15 – *Approval of New ToRs and RoPs for the IHO SPWG*.

This proposal satisfies much of the underlying intention of Australia's PRO 15. In our view, the SPWG should undertake the work of revising the IHO Strategic Plan. This is appropriate since it was the SPWG that identified the requirement for a new Strategic Plan in the first place.

BRAZIL

As commented in Proposal 3, the Brazilian opinion that hydrographic interest is a matter of strategic interest of the Organization and, therefore, the Group must be formed in the same conditions as the future Council that will be composed. The evaluating of the Group composition must be part of its Terms of Reference.

CROATIA

Croatia supports this proposal.

FINLAND

Finland supports the proposal submitted by the SPWG.

FRANCE

France approves this proposal and suggests that the membership and the chairmanship of the working group be modeled on that adopted for the Strategic Planning Working Group (a representative designated by each regional hydrographic commission and possibility for any Member State, who so desires, to designate a representative on an individual basis; chairman and vice-chairman elected by the members). If there was any risk of this working group being compared by a majority to a "pre-council", the legitimacy of which might be contested as long as the protocol of amendments to the Convention has not entered into force, an alternative could be to give the chairmanship of the working group to the President of the Directing Committee of the IHO, as has already been done in the past.

GREECE

Greece supports this proposal.

NETHERLANDS

The Netherlands have the following remarks regarding this proposal:

The importance of the revision of the strategic plan is undisputed. Given the nature of the proposed strategic issues a close coordination with both the Directing Committee and the proposed HSCC and IRCC guarantees consistency and transparency between the strategic and future work plans. This approach also contributes to the acceptance of the revised strategic plan in the EIHC 2009. If there is approval of the proposals 8 and 9, then the proposed WG should coordinate with the bureau and the developing HSCC and IRCC.

NORWAY

Norway supports this proposal.

UNITED KINGDOM

UK supports the proposals.

UK would wish to participate in the Working Group to revise the IHO's Strategic Plan, if approved by Conference.

PRO 13 - EDITORIAL AMENDMENTS TO THE HOST AGREEMENT

Submitted by: The Strategic Planning Working Group

The Conference is requested to direct the President of the IHB, following approval of the amendments to the IHO Convention, to liaise with the Monegasque Government to make any necessary editorial amendments to the Host Agreement and to present the result to MS by Circular Letter.

MEMBER STATES' COMMENTS

CROATIA

Croatia supports this proposal.

FINLAND

Finland supports the proposal submitted by the SPWG.

FRANCE

France approves this proposal.

GREECE

Greece supports this proposal.

NORWAY

Norway supports this proposal.

UNITED KINGDOM

UK supports the proposals.

PRO 14 - AMENDMENTS TO TECHICAL RESOLUTION T1.1

Submitted by: The Strategic Planning Working Group

The Conference is requested to approve the text of an amended Resolution T1.1, which will enter into force on 1 January 2009 and be cancelled after the entry into force of the amendments to the Convention.

T1.1 FORMATION OF IHO SUBSIDIARY ORGANS AND SUBORDINATE BODIES

- 1.- *Recognizing that the Convention, Article VI, paragraph 7, provides that the Conference shall constitute its own Committees and, further recognizing that Rules 21 and 22 of the Rules of Procedure for International Hydrographic Conferences outline the procedures for establishing subsidiary bodies deemed necessary for the performance of the functions of the Conference,*
- 2.- *Further recognizing the need to establish subsidiary bodies to carry out work of an ongoing nature in the intersessionary period between Conferences,*
- 3.- *Further recognizing the advantages to the IHO of making use of the special knowledge and experience that exists within Member States, in the hydrographic and associated fields,*
- 4.- *Resolves to establish intersessionary subsidiary bodies, additional to those that may be formed under Rule 21 of the Rules of Procedure for Hydrographic Conferences, to contribute to the work of the IHO and to the Bureau in particular. Such bodies are open to all Member States.*
- 5.- *The following types of subsidiary bodies may be established in accordance with the procedures specified in paragraph 6 below.*
 - a) *a committee, being a subsidiary organ whose life expectancy is longer than the time period between two consecutive ordinary sessions of the Conference;*
 - b) *sub-committee, being a subordinate body to a committee, whose life expectancy is longer than the time period between two consecutive ordinary sessions of the Conference; or*
 - c) *a working group, being a subordinate body formed to examine a particular subject.*
- 6.- *Procedures governing inter-sessionary subsidiary bodies*
 - a) *When establishing a subsidiary organ the Conference shall determine the Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure of that subsidiary organ, which shall clearly state, as a minimum, its objectives, its composition, the method for determining its chair, and its reporting procedures.*
 - b) *When proposing the establishment of a sub-committee, the Finance Committee or any subsidiary organ shall prepare draft Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure for that sub-committee, which shall clearly state, as a minimum, its objectives, its composition, the method for determining its chair, and its reporting procedures.*
 - c) *When proposing the establishment of a working group, the Finance Committee or any subsidiary organ shall determine and approve the Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure of that working group, which shall clearly state, as a minimum, its objectives, its composition, the method for determining its chair, and its reporting procedures.*

- d) *Draft Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure prepared by the Finance Committee or any subsidiary organ in accordance with paragraph (b) above shall be forwarded to the IHB who will:*
- (i) *submit them to Member States for approval by correspondence, or*
 - (ii) *if such drafts are received one year or less before the opening day of the next ordinary session of the Conference, submit them to the Conference for approval.*

EXPLANATORY NOTE

Articles 6 and 8 of the Amended General Regulations deal with the formation of IHO subsidiary organs and subordinate bodies. Amendments to the present T 1.1 to bring it in line with the above mentioned articles are necessary in the transition period until the ratification of the Convention is made and the re-structuring is fully implemented.

MEMBER STATES' COMMENTS

CROATIA

Croatia supports this proposal.

FINLAND

Finland supports the proposal submitted by the SPWG.

FRANCE

France approves this proposal subject to the editorial corrections required in the French text.

NORWAY

Norway supports this proposal.

UNITED KINGDOM

The Strategic Planning Working Group sets out in the Explanatory Note to PRO 14 the reasons why it proposes changes to TR1.1. The United Kingdom agrees with that reasoning.

Although the UKHO has been actively involved in the work of the SPWG, on further studying the SPWG's PRO 14 text, we have the following particular observation:

- At paragraph 5.d) there is a reference to IHO representation in other fora, which, the United Kingdom submits, is inappropriate in T1.1. Instead, it should be inserted as a new paragraph in T1.2. The change is proposed in the spirit of ensuring that the information it contains is readily accessible in the future by anyone wishing to consult the appropriate Resolution on IHO Relations with other Organizations.

It is therefore proposed that:

- paragraph 5.d) of PRO 14 is deleted
- Technical Resolution T1.2 is amended by deleting the second and third sentences of paragraph 3 and adding a new paragraph 3A, to read as follows:
 - 3.- *When the importance of subjects of common interest justify it, the Directing Committee may propose to Member States the formation of a consultative body consisting of representatives of the IHO and of one or several external organization(s).*
 - 3A.- *Proposals for IHO representation in Inter-organizational bodies (inter-alia Boards, Projects, cooperative activities etc.), whether made in accordance with paragraph 3 above or otherwise, shall be submitted to the Conference for the formulation of the principles for such representation and the approval of its joint Terms of Reference.*

PRO 15 - APPROVAL OF NEW TERMS OF REFERENCE AND RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR THE IHO STRATEGIC PLANNING WORKING GROUP

Submitted by: Australia

The Conference is requested to approve the new Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure for the IHO Strategic Planning Working Group as indicated below:

AUSTRALIA HAS WITHDRAWN THIS PROPOSAL

EXPLANATORY NOTE

The SPWG has concluded most of the tasks that the 16th IHC and the 3rd EIHC assigned to it and therefore the Report of the 8th SPWG Meeting suggested to “*discontinue it as no new tasks to justify the continuation of its work have been found*”.

Australia believes that the transition to the new structure of Committees proposed in Proposals 8 and 9 of the SPWG to the 17th IH Conference will be smoother and more efficient if a provisional body assumes the some of the functions of the future Council.

Australia proposes that the SPWG is the appropriate body to undertake this task by adopting amended Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure proposed below.

PROPOSED TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE SPWG

1. Coordinate, during the inter-Conference period, in liaison with the IHB Directing Committee the activities of the Organization within the framework of the Strategic Plan and Work Programme;
2. Report to the Conference at each ordinary session on the work of the Organization;
3. Prepare, with the support of the IHB Directing Committee, proposals concerning the overall strategy and the work programme to be adopted by the Conference;
4. Review proposals submitted to it by the IHO Committees and Regional Hydrographic Commissions and refer them:
 - To the Conference for all matters referred to policy or finances of the Organization;
 - Back to the Committees if considered necessary; or
 - To the Member States for adoption, by IHB Circular Letter;
5. Propose to the Conference the establishment of subsidiary organs; and
6. Review draft agreements between the Organization and other organizations, and submit them to the Conference or to Member States by IHB Circular Letter for approval;
7. Any other task that may be assigned to it by the Conference.

PROPOSED RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR THE SPWG

1. The SPWG will include representatives designated by the IHO Regional Hydrographic Commissions. Individual Member States may be represented if they consider it necessary.
2. The SPWG shall request the assistance of legal experts when it is deemed necessary.
3. The SPWG will elect its Chair and Vice-Chair, each of whom shall hold office until the end of the next ordinary session of the Conference or until the entry into force of the amendments to the IHO Convention.

IHB COMMENT

The IHB Directing Committee has the following concerns regarding this proposal:

1. Most of the proposed ToR (as example, 1, 2, 3 and 6) are the responsibility of the Bureau according to the Basic Documents in force. Its possible adoption will violate the current Convention and Regulations.
2. These ToR and RoP for the SPWG will result in establishing a "pseudo Council" that could have negative effect in the work of the Bureau and the future properly established Council.
3. The Council as an important component of the new structure must be established and operate together with the other Organs of the Organization, when the amendments to the Convention enter in force".

MEMBER STATES' COMMENTS

AUSTRALIA

Australia agrees with the comments of the IHB regarding the existing responsibilities of the IHB and does not intend that the SPWG should usurp these.

We have commented under PRO 12 that the SPWG should revise the IHO Strategic Plan. In doing so, it is reasonable to expect that the SPWG will take into account the overall progress and achievements of the IHO and its Work Programme. As such, the intention of Australia's PRO 15 is largely satisfied.

In the circumstances, Australia withdraws PRO 15.

BRAZIL

Although, as the proposal is written, there are being conflicts of functions between the SPWG and the IHB, Brazil considers that the SPWG can function as a IHB adviser, been a kind of assay for the composition of the future Council.

CROATIA

Croatia does not support this proposal.

Croatia supports IHB comment on this proposal.

FINLAND

Finland does not support the proposal submitted by Australia. Finland agrees with the comments presented by the IHB.

FRANCE

France considers that implementing PRO 12 would provide sufficient support to the Bureau up until the Council becomes operational and will thus meet the objective of this proposal.

GERMANY

Germany shares the concerns expressed by the IHB. Any revisions to the existing TORs of SPWG should be made on the basis of Annex L of the SPWG Report concerning the status and progress of the Strategic Plan and Work Programme (CONF.17/DOC.1), taking into account which items of the current TORs have been completed.

GREECE

Greece concurs with the comments made by the IHB Directing Committee.

NETHERLANDS

The Netherlands have the following remarks regarding this proposal:

The importance of a smooth transition to the new structure from 1st January 2009 onwards is undisputed. Four of the seven proposed ToR amendments reflect the present tasking of the Directing Committee, it is up to the Directing Committee to identify possible shortcomings in capacity and ask MS approval for the establishment of subordinate working groups. Efficiency will be gained if the Conference tasks the Directing Committee with the remainder of the proposed ToR until 1st January 2009. This will also safeguard proper coordination with the strategic WG as mentioned in Proposal 12.

NORWAY

Norway agrees with the comments from IHB.

UNITED KINGDOM

UK does not support this proposal.

UK agrees with the concerns expressed by the IHB regarding this proposal; the effect of adoption of Proposal 15 would be the establishment of a Council by stealth. Also, if Proposal 12 is adopted, a Working Group will be established to revise the Strategic Plan, which UK considers is the remaining strategic work to be completed.

USA

Agree with IHB comments.

PRO 16 - AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 6 OF THE GENERAL REGULATIONS, AND TO RULE 5 OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR IHO CONFERENCES REGARDING OBSERVERS, SO AS TO COMPLY WITH EIHC 3 DECISION No. 5.

Submitted by: Germany

Reference: Decision No. 5 of the 3rd Extraordinary International Hydrographic Conference

PROPOSAL

The Conference is invited to approve the following amendments to the Basic Documents regarding the participation of observers in IHO Conferences:

**General Regulations
ARTICLE 6**

“The Directing Committee shall be authorized to invite observers from:

(a)”

Replace paragraphs (b) and (c):

- (b) International organizations whose activities are connected with those of the Bureau : one or exceptionally two observers each. A list of such organizations shall be notified by the Directing Committee to Member Governments in advance, so that they may have opportunity to raise objections or suggest additions.
- (c) National organizations of Member Governments which have had or are likely to have occasion to collaborate with the Bureau, under the conditions prescribed in the preceding paragraph.

So as to read:

- (b) *Inter-governmental organizations with which an agreement or special arrangement has been made: one or exceptionally two observers each; and*
- (c) *Non-governmental international organizations with which the Organization has established appropriate relationships in accordance with the Guidelines for the Accreditation of Non-governmental International Organizations: one or exceptionally two observers each.*

Rules of Procedure for IHO Conferences, Rule 5, Invitation to observers:

“The Bureau shall invite to be represented at any session of the Conference:

(a)

(b)”

Replace paragraphs (c) and (d):

- (c) Inter-governmental and non-governmental organizations whose activities are connected with those of the Bureau : one or exceptionally two observers each. A list of such organizations shall be notified by the Bureau to all Members so that they may have an opportunity to raise objections or suggest additions.
- (d) National organizations of Members which have had or are likely to have occasion to collaborate with the Bureau, under the conditions prescribed in the preceding paragraph.

So as to read:

- (c) *Inter-governmental organizations with which an agreement or special arrangement has been made: one or exceptionally two observers each; and*
- (d) *Non-governmental international organizations with which the Organization has established appropriate relationships in accordance with the Guidelines for the Accreditation of Non-governmental International Organizations: one or exceptionally two observers each.*

EXPLANATORY NOTE

The 3rd EIHC has decided as follows:

***DECISION No. 5 AGREEMENT WITH THE PRINCIPLES LAID DOWN FOR THE
GUIDELINES OF ACCREDITATION OF NGIOS (PRO 5)***

The Conference agreed with the principles laid down for the guidelines of accreditation of NGIOS. The Conference also agreed, following the proposal from Chile, to implement the rules regarding the granting of observer status to NGIOS, with immediate effect.

Consequently, the principles as agreed by the Conference are in force by which:

- Only non-governmental international organizations (NGIOS) are eligible for being granted observer status, thereby ruling out national NGOs from being awarded observer status
- Only those NGIOS who have been accredited by IHO can attend meetings of IHO bodies; this would apply to only those organizations shown in *italics* in the list annexed to CCL 8.

Unfortunately, decision No. 5 has subsequently not been implemented in the Basic Documents yet. Therefore, the current provisions of General Regulations Art. 6 and Rules of Procedure for IHO Conferences allowing also the participation of NGOs which are not accredited, and of national NGOs, have not been adjusted to Decision No. 5, and appear, although conflicting in detail with the Conference Decision, also still in force until the Day of Ratification of the amendments to the Convention and its associated Basic Documents. This creates, as this Conference already proves, an ambivalent situation.

In order to remove the ambivalence, it appears necessary to amend the current Basic Documents, where relevant to the invitation of observers, to comply with the provisions of the Principles of Accreditation of NGIOS as adopted by the 3rd EIHC by its Decision No. 5. The proposed text has been taken from the current draft General Regulations (as of 27 June 2006). In absence of any detailed provisions for Committees and Working Groups in the present version of the Basic Documents the above amendment is applicable only to IHO Conferences.

MEMBER STATES' COMMENTS

CROATIA

Croatia supports this proposal.

FINLAND

Finland supports the proposal submitted by Germany.

FRANCE

France approves this proposal and recommends adopting the final wording of the two corresponding paragraphs of the amended General Regulations, which is the subject of PRO 3.

GREECE

Greece supports this proposal.

NORWAY

Norway supports this proposal.

UNITED KINGDOM

UK supports the proposal.

PRO 17 - CANCELLING A CONFERENCE DECISION

Submitted by: Spain

Reference: Decision N° 5 of the Second Extraordinary International Conference (2000)

The Conference is requested to cancel Decision N° 5 of the Second Extraordinary International Conference, which states that:

“The Conference decided to hold an extraordinary International Hydrographic Conference between two ordinary Conferences”

The Conference approved this Proposal, but decided to hold an Extraordinary International Hydrographic Conference in 2009 which will consider the Report of the ISPWG (IHO Strategic Plan Working Group) and the Progress on the Ratification of the Protocol of amendments to the Convention.

EXPLANATORY NOTE

The 2nd EIHC felt that the existing period of 5 years between two ordinary Conferences was a too long period for the efficiency and progress of the organization and therefore decided to shorten the period by means of having an Extraordinary Conference permanently called between two Ordinary Conferences.

This decision was contested by some countries as anti-constitutional, based on the meaning of the term “Extraordinary”

Since then (2000), the 3rd Extraordinary International Conference, in 2005, approved a new structure for the IHO, including the organization of an Assembly every three years.

Spain feels that Decision N° 5 of the 2nd EIHC, is now superseded by the decisions of the 3rd IEHC and therefore proposes to delete it.

It is also felt that, in the intermediate period until the new structure is implemented, the present Article VI of the Convention includes the necessary provisions to organize any Extraordinary Conference that may be deemed by the IHO.

MEMBER STATES' COMMENTS

AUSTRALIA

Australia continues to hold its view that it is unconstitutional to programme Extraordinary Hydrographic Conferences on a perpetual basis. In our view, the appropriate mechanism to convene an EIHC is to follow the processes laid out in Article VI.1 of the Convention on the IHO. In our view, a separate proposal should be made for each instance of an EIHC.

BRAZIL

The amendments to the Convention had still not entered in force and there has no prevision/ expectation to do so. The cancellation of the Decision No. 5 of the Second Extraordinary International Hydrographic Conference, at this moment, will cause an interruption of the activities initiated in 2002, becoming the IHO less efficient and effective.

CROATIA

Croatia supports this proposal.

FINLAND

Finland supports the proposal submitted by Spain.

FRANCE

France does not think that there is any need to pursue with this proposal, insofar as the implementation steps of the incriminated decision are in line with the provisions given in the higher authority texts which are currently in force (see comments on point 1 of Proposal 2).

GREECE

Greece supports this proposal.

JAPAN

This Conference Decision is needed before the amended Convention enters into force and the Decision loses its effect automatically after entering into force when the word "Conference" of the Decision has no meaning. That is to say, there is no need to approve this proposal, so Japan does not support Proposal 17.

NORWAY

Norway does not agree with this proposal, as decision No 5 of the 2nd EIHC is not superseded by the decision of the 3rd EIHC until the Amended Convention enters in to force.

UNITED KINGDOM

UK does not support this proposal.

UK considers that Extraordinary IH conferences should continue to be held between successive ordinary conferences, until the new structure for IHO is implemented (with an Assembly every 3 years).

USA

In the EXPLANATORY NOTE: Do not agree that Decision No. 5 of the 2nd EIHC is now superseded, but can agree to deletion. Agree with other content of the note.

PRO 18 – PROVISION OF REGIONAL STAFF OFFICERS FOR CAPACITY BUILDING EFFORT

Submitted by: United Kingdom

PROPOSAL

The Conference is requested to ask the CBC, in consultation with RHCs, to consider the part-time allocation of personnel to act as Regional Staff Officers to assist those chairmen of Regional Hydrographic Commissions (RHCs) who have limited human resources with which to sustain the capacity building effort in their regions. It is suggested that the priorities for provision of such a post should be EAthC, MACHC, NIOHC, SAIHC and SWPHC.

EXPLANATORY NOTE

1. The IHO Capacity Building Fund is now in receipt of generous donations from Member States, and the most serious constraint on activity in Work Programme 2 is availability of human resources. Whilst Member States have also been generous in supporting the IHO's Capacity Building programme with personnel with the appropriate skills, the demands are increasing as the revived strategy of the organization builds up momentum and more and more proposals are approved by the Capacity Building Committee (CBC).
2. Two particularly demanding aspects of capacity building effort are the planning and preparation of missions and training events, and the follow up to these activities. Much of the pressure falls on the RHC Chairmen. In many of the RHCs where the demands for capacity building assistance are high, the Chairmen are drawn from small Hydrographic Offices with few staff. The IHB Secretariat has limited capacity with which to support them.
3. During 2003-07, on completion of the initial stages of the project to update S-55, and in consistency with his role of Vice Chairman IHOCBC, the UK has made Captain M K Barritt RN available to the IHO on a part-time basis to support the capacity building programme. He has been able to take a substantial planning and follow up role in several major capacity building initiatives. This model is the basis of this proposal to the International Hydrographic Conference.
4. Capacity building efforts are likely to be concentrated in the EAthC, MACHC, NIOHC, SAIHC and SWPHC regions, and it is recommended that the priority should be to provide Regional Staff Officers for them. Whilst desirable for liaison with the RHC Chairmen, it is not essential for a Regional Staff Officer to be based within a region. E-mail communication enables most planning and discussion to be conducted in a timely, cost-effective and proficient way.
5. The IMO has Regional Advisers in several of the regions listed at paragraph 4, and their co-operation has facilitated a number of recent IHO technical visit programmes. IHO Regional Staff Officers could work closely with their permanent IMO counter-parts, reinforcing the strategic partnership between the two organizations.
6. It would be desirable for personnel to be made available to the IHO for this role at nil cost. However, as the CBC Fund grows, consideration could be given to funding a part-time occupant, perhaps to take forward a specific activity or project. This employment would provide an excellent career development opportunity.

MEMBER STATES' COMMENTS

AUSTRALIA

Australia supports the principles of this PRO 18. However, the scope of activity and other practical details such as the terms of employment, and roles and responsibilities of the regional staff have not been defined. It may be appropriate to task the CBC to consider this proposal further and if supported, the CBC should develop a business case for subsequent consideration by the IHO.

BRAZIL

The CBC activity in the scope of the IHO is recent and, within the Regional Hydrographic Commissions, it is in a very insipient stage. There is not yet a clear discussion to the use of the personnel.

Brazil considers that the subject must be studied by the Capacity Building Committee and, after its opinion, be voted by the Conference.

CROATIA

Croatia supports this proposal.

Besides supporting this proposal along with all the comments, it is our opinion that MBSHC should be added to the priority list of regional commissions requiring the assistance of regional staff officers, as it is the largest regional commission embracing hydrographic services at different stages of development. Some member states, by their level of organisation, budget, and hydrographic interest, are among leading HOs in the IHO, but many of them lack even minimum resources for the conduct of hydrographic service. The most obvious argument for that is the pressing problem of hosting the MBSHC Conference. For some member states in the region, due to objective restrictions, taking charge of the organisation and two-year chairmanship of the MBSHC Conference would involve serious financial and organisational problems. Another very important limiting factor is insufficient staff and inadequate competence for managing complex hydrographic issues on the MBSHC agenda. We believe that holding the Conference every year would even intensify this problem. We therefore propose to amend the proposal by adding the MBSHC to the priority list.

FINLAND

Finland supports the proposal. Finland believes that the availability of ENCs is a vital strategic issue to the IHO for the next 2 or 3 years. Thus all means for the fostering of ENC production should be utilized.

Finland proposes that the main issue in the TOR for the proposed Staff Officers will be the fostering of ENC production. The IHO may have one main "IHO ENC Coordinator" who should assist the development of the ENC production. He or she should follow up the agreed actions and report to Member States regularly. In addition there may be Regional Staff Officers on each area.

Finland believes that this is one concrete action to response to the requirement presented by the IMO NAV Sub-committee, WEND Committees and ECDIS Stakeholders' Forum.

FRANCE

Whilst approving the arguments which underlie this proposal, France is concerned by the risk that the establishment of Regional Staff Officers might incite the Regional Hydrographic Commission Chairmen not to fully devote themselves to their task. France therefore recommends that this proposal should not be submitted to the Conference for a formal decision, but should be referred to the Capacity Building Committee for a study, on a case by case basis, of the needs of the RHC and the possible solutions, in particular to examine their feasibility and impact on the operating costs of the IHO.

GREECE

Greece supports this proposal.

JAPAN

Japan could not catch the meanings of the proposal clearly and requests more detailed explanation on it, especially as of the budget point.

NETHERLANDS

The Netherlands have the following remarks regarding this proposal:

As a result of the IHO CBC initiatives many RHCs are now involved with the identification of regional CBC objectives with accompanying work plans. The importance to gain or maintain momentum in this development is undisputed. It should be a RHC responsibility to identify shortcomings in capacity to execute the approved RHC CBC work plan and to solve this first within the RHC and if appropriate finally in consultation with IHO CBC or IRCC. The proposal for a regional staff officer could be an option if endorsed by the RHC but not a prerequisite. This approach reflects the proposed future IRCC ToR, it keeps the RHC involved and responsible for the work plan and precludes duplication of work.

NORWAY

Whilst agreeing with the aim of this proposal, Norway believes that the Conference should restrict itself to task the CBC to consider the proposal as one of several means to achieve its goals, consulting also RHCs, and report back to Member States.

UNITED KINGDOM

The proposal was submitted by UK, therefore, we support.

**PRO 19 – ESTABLISHMENT OF A WORKING GROUP TO STUDY AND PROPOSE
A NEW EDITION OF THE IHB STAFF REGULATIONS**

Submitted by: IHB

PROPOSAL

The Conference is requested to approve the establishment of a Working Group to study and propose a new edition of the IHB Staff Regulations.

WORKING GROUP TO REVIEW IHB STAFF REGULATIONS

Name

Staff Regulations Working Group

Terms of Reference

1. Conduct a holistic review of the existing IHB Staff Regulations
2. Propose any changes to the Staff regulations necessary to administer the IHB effectively using consistent and internationally accepted procedures.
3. Propose any additional changes to the Staff regulations that would be necessary upon implementation of the new Secretariat organization.
4. To provide a Report on its work by Circular Letter to Member States in 2009.

Chair and Vice Chair

To be determined by this Conference

Membership

The Working Group is open to all Member States.

Member States wishing to participate should preferably provide representatives with relevant personnel administration experience.

The IHB will be represented in the Working Group.

Working Method

The Working Group shall encourage maximum participation by working mainly by correspondence using information technology, with face-to-face meetings of the full membership no more frequently than necessary.

EXPLANATORY NOTE

The Staff Regulations have evolved, since their inception in 1974, through a series of loosely related Conference Decisions and Directing Committee modifications into the current 7th Edition. A cursory inspection of the document reveals several errors and numerous inconsistencies. Additionally, The transition to the Secretariat organization specified under the amended Convention of the IHO may require substantive changes to certain provisions of the Staff Regulations.

While the IHB is intimately familiar with the majority of the inadequacies of the current document, an unprejudiced perspective is warranted for both a balanced review and an assessment of the financial implications of any proposed changes. Furthermore, a review of staff regulations pertaining to similar international organizations would provide a reference regarding current norms with respect to benefits and regulations. To this end a Working Group with support from the IHB is recommended to conduct a holistic review of the Staff Regulations, to propose changes to the Staff Regulations necessary to effectively administer the IHB through consistent and internationally accepted procedures and to propose additional changes to the Staff Regulations that would be necessary upon implementation of the new Secretariat organization.

MEMBER STATES' COMMENTS

CROATIA

Croatia supports this proposal.

FINLAND

Finland supports the proposal submitted by the IHB.

FRANCE

France supports this proposal and recommends vigilance in forming the working group, the membership of which should be properly targeted in order to bring together, along with the Bureau, the complete range of competencies required to successfully undertake this study in the best possible conditions.

GREECE

Greece supports this proposal.

NORWAY

Norway supports this proposal.

UNITED KINGDOM

UK supports this proposal.

UK would wish to participate in the Working Group to study and propose a new edition of the IHB Staff Regulations, if approved by Conference.

USA

No comment. If formed, the U.S. will want to participate.

PRO 20 - ESTABLISHMENT OF A WORKING GROUP ON HYDROGRAPHY AND CARTOGRAPHY OF INLAND WATERS

Submitted by : Argentina

Supported by : Brazil, Ecuador, Peru, South Africa, Uruguay, USA and Venezuela.

PROPOSAL

The Conference is requested to ask CHRIS to establish of a Working Group on Hydrography and Cartography of Inland Waters, to set its Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure noting the guidelines below, and to report on its work to the 4th EIHC in 2009.

The purpose of the Working Group will be to analyze and recommend the level and nature of IHO involvement in the Hydrography and Cartography of Inland Waterways.

The Working Group should involve all relevant non IHO international bodies in its deliberations, including the IEHG.

The Conference should note that this will be included in business of the 4th EIHC.

EXPLANATORY NOTE

The vision, the mission, and objectives for IHO approved by the 3rd EIHC do not restrict IHO activities to ocean and coastal areas. On the contrary, its scope should be generic, and include all navigable waters.

Until these days, for any reasons (don't expressed necessity, heterogeneous areas with specifics treatments, etc.), IHO just have had take care of maritime areas.

Inland navigation is increasing and taking an increasing importance around the world, both in vessel transits or tonnage transport.

Vessels movements cruising more than one country are increasing and requiring facilities and support for their sailing, which includes a minimum standard of navigation security information.

In 2003 a group of countries established an independent Inland Electronic Charts Harmonization Group (IEHG - www.ccr-zkr.org; www.unece.org) and some of them have actively participated in WEND and CHRIS meetings.

Today, hydrographic and nautical cartographic standards for inland navigable waters constitutes a gap on IHO duties.

Terms of Reference

The Working Group on Hydrography and Cartography of Inland Waters shall:

- a) Identify, in the light of the IHO's Vision, Mission and Objectives, the IHO's applicability/ pertinence to be involved with the production of hydrographic data and provision of hydrographic services in Inland Waters.
- b) Identify actions that the IHO should take to contribute to Hydrography and Cartography of Inland Waters and propose which IHO bodies should foster these actions.
- c) Propose the appropriate Technical and/or Administrative Resolutions that should reflect the IHO's policy with regard to Hydrography and Cartography of Inland Waters.
- d) Submit a Report to the IHO through the IHB by 15 December 2008.

Rules of Procedure

- 1. The Working Group on Hydrography and Cartography of Inland Waters is composed of Member States' representatives that have expressed their willingness to participate. The IHB will arrange to establish this WG.
- 2. The Chairman and Vice Chairman are elected by the WG from its membership by correspondence. The WG will also have a Secretary, nominated by the IHB Directing Committee.
- 3. The WG will have its permanent secretariat at the IHB, Monaco. The secretariat will provide the secretarial and administrative support needed to gather, hold and disseminate information on behalf of the WG. The Secretary will provide a summary of the WG's activities to be included in the IHO Annual Report.
- 4. The WG will normally and preferably work by correspondence. If necessary, presential meetings may be set.
- 5. Decisions should generally be made by consensus. If votes are required, decisions will be taken by simple majority of Members of the WG.

PRO 21 - A RESOLUTION ON ENC COVERAGE IN RELATION TO ECDIS CARRIAGE REQUIREMENTS

Submitted by: Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden

Reference: DNV Technical Report “Effect of ENC Coverage on ECDIS Risk Reduction”

The Conference is requested to endorse the following resolution:

IHO

- Realizing that even in the paper chart world, a complete coverage of high quality nautical charts does not exist.
- Furthermore realizing that it is not realistic to expect a complete world wide coverage of ENCs in all waters in the foreseeable future.
- Recognizing that shipping is more congested in some areas and routes around the world than others.
- Consequently also recognizes the need to identify congested areas and as a minimum ensure the earliest possible coverage of ENCs in those areas.
- Having considered the report from DNV on the “Effect of ENC Coverage on ECDIS Risk Reduction” establishing that:
 - a significant coverage of suitable ENCs are already available to the international shipping community, and
 - the implementation of ECDIS will enhance safety at sea, and
 - the implementation of ECDIS is found to be cost efficient for new as well as existing ships above a certain size.
- Noting that the Conference reaffirmed its commitments to the WEND Principles.
- Strongly supports the efforts by IMO to introduce mandatory carriage requirements for ECDIS, emphasizing that:
 - A significant coverage of ENCs is already in place and will be further improved by 2010, as indicated in the DNV report and supported by IHO assessments, and secondly that
 - Acceptance of mandatory carriage requirements will further accelerate the production of ENCs

EXPLANATORY NOTE:

IMO MSC 81 has tasked the Sub-Committee on Navigation (NAV) to consider the implementation of ECDIS carriage requirements and submit a proposal to this effect to MSC. The task will be carried out over the next two meetings of NAV (NAV 53 and NAV 54).

Previous discussions on this issue have taken place in IMO NAV and other international organizations as well as relevant conferences and industry foras (e.g. ECDIS Stakeholders Forum). From these discussions it is obvious that **ENC coverage in general**, and the question of what represents “**a suitable ENC coverage**” in particular will be a major issue to consider by IMO.

IHO, being recognized by IMO as a competent international organization with respect to nautical chart issues (ref e.g. SOLAS), has an important role to play in the upcoming discussion in IMO. A clear intention of IMO to implement mandatory ECDIS carriage requirement is expected to represent a strong incentive for States that have not yet produced ENCs in critical parts of their waters, to do so in a timely way.

IHO should be prepared to communicate this to IMO in a consistent way. To assist in the preparations, as well as qualifying the basis for the discussion that will take place in IMO, the Maritime Administrations and Hydrographic Offices of Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden tasked DNV to assess the actual impact of ENC coverage on the safety effect of ECDIS. Below the Conclusive Summary of the report, that has been made available on the IHO Web Site, is reiterated:

“This report outlines a recent study on the risk reducing effect of Electronic Chart Display and Information System (ECDIS) to improve the navigational safety on cargo ships. Previous studies have shown that ECDIS is a cost effective risk control option for large passenger ships and for certain cargo ships sailing particular trades. The aim of this study has been twofold: 1) to take the actual coverage of Electronic Navigational Charts (ENC) into account and adjust the risk reduction effect of ECDIS accordingly and 2) to extend the scope to include all cargo ships of different size (above 500 GT) and age. This has been achieved using three complementary approaches. First, actual historic traffic data has been overlaid actual ENC coverage to evaluate the extent of global coverage for suitable ENC. Secondly, eleven specific routes have been analysed to evaluate the grounding risk reducing potential of ECDIS, when considering actual ENC coverage. Finally, the average grounding risk reduction has been used to evaluate cost effectiveness for ECDIS for varying ship types, sizes and ages.

The study on actual current and near future ENC coverage showed that:

- a. The global coverage of suitable ENC in coastal areas currently lies between 84% and 96% and is expected to increase to 87 – 98% within a few years.*
- b. The coverage of suitable ENC along selected routes varies between a minimum of 28% to a maximum of 100% for selected representative routes.*
- c. 36% of the selected routes (4 of 11 routes) already have 100% ENC coverage in coastal areas.*
- d. For 5 of the 7 routes currently without 100% ENC coverage, an increase of coverage is planned for the near future.*
- e. The grounding frequency reductions achievable from implementing ECDIS vary between 11% and 38% for the selected routes. This variation is due to variations in ENC coverage.*
- f. It is expected that ECDIS may result in 9.1×10^{-3} groundings averted per shipyear on average, and that this will increase to 10.0×10^{-3} groundings per shipyear in the near future, when planned extended ENC coverage becomes available.*

The assessment of cost effectiveness revealed that Net Cost of Averting a Fatality (NCAF) is less than USD 3 million for various combinations of ship types, sizes and ages. For most of these combinations, NCAF < 0. Based on the analysis reported herein, and the current cost efficiency criteria used at IMO, the following recommendations may be proposed:

- i. ECDIS should be made mandatory for all new oil tankers of 500 gross tonnage and upwards.*
- ii. ECDIS should be made mandatory for all new cargo ships, other than oil tankers, of 3,000 gross tonnage and upwards.*
- iii. ECDIS should be made mandatory for all existing oil tankers of 3,000 gross tonnage and upwards.*
- iv. ECDIS should be made mandatory for all existing cargo ships, other than oil tankers, 10,000 gross tonnage and upwards.*
- v. Exemptions may be given to existing oil tankers of less than 10,000 gross tonnage and existing cargo ships, other than oil tankers, less than 50,000 gross tonnage when such ships will be taken permanently out of service within 5 years after the implementation dates given for iii) and iv) above.”*

PRO 22 - ESTABLISHMENT OF A WORKING GROUP ON MARINE SPATIAL DATA INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT

Submitted by: United Kingdom and Germany

PROPOSAL

The Conference is requested to ask CHRIS to establish a Working Group on the Hydrographic Community inputs to National Spatial Data Infrastructures (NSDI), to set its Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure, noting the guidelines in the Annex, and to report to the 4th EIHC in 2009.

EXPLANATORY NOTES

In March 2007, Vice Admiral Maratos [President of the IHB] stated that “The HO is an important part of the National Geospatial Data Infrastructure and the IHO has an important role to play in coordinating requirements and demands for data collection, interoperability, dissemination, access, standards, security, pricing, policy and funding models for hydrographic data”.

At the IHO Seminar held in Rostock, Germany in November 2005, the IHO stated that the development and management of SDI rest with the Member States and that the role of national HO's within NSDI will be for that country to define. However, the IHO is keen to raise awareness of the value and benefit of supporting Marine Spatial Data Infrastructure (MSDI) and NSDI across Member States.

The IHO offers to examine the needs of Member States and provide capacity building support to requests for assistance. IHO will also determine its role within the framework of an evolving Global Spatial Data Infrastructure (GSDI).

MSDI is the component of NSDI that encompasses marine geographic and business information in its widest sense. This would typically include seabed topography, geology, marine infrastructure (e.g. wrecks, offshore installations, pipelines and cables, Special Areas of Conservation etc); administrative and legal boundaries, areas of conservation and marine habitats and oceanography.

SDI, at whatever level, is a framework comprising policies to create information that is interoperable. This is often linked to a national or organisational strategy for geographic information (GI). There needs to be willingness and practical co-operation between the various organisations who create, share and use information to implement the overall policy. In addition, essential building blocks in the development of NSDI providing the framework for data acquisition, management and updating are necessary. Examples include Geodetic Reference Systems, Standards for geographic information and Metadata (e.g. IHO S-100, ISO 191xx).

Data is at the core of SDI and should ideally be application-neutral thereby ensuring that it meets the needs of the widest user base.

The IHO has a responsibility to develop a wider remit as part of its role in representing the hydrographic community and to ensure that Member States interests are represented in the creation of MSDI and NSDI. This requires liaison with other relevant marine communities, most importantly the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC), to ensure a homogenous MSDI.

Annex I to PRO 22**Terms of Reference**

The Working Group on Marine Spatial Data Infrastructure Development (MSDI-WG) shall:

1. Identify, in line with IHO objectives, mission and vision, the IHO's pertinence to be involved in the development of SDI's across Member States.
2. Examine technical issues related to ensuring interoperability within MSDI and with land-based SDIs, in particular:
 - Datum issues,
 - S-100 interoperability with land-based SDIs,
 - S-100 interoperability with oceanographic, marine biological, geological and geophysical data structures, and recommend solutions.
3. Liaise, as appropriate, with other relevant technical bodies such as of IOC, World Data Centers Oceanography, Bathymetry and Marine Geophysics.
4. Identify actions and procedures the IHO should take to contribute to the development of National Spatial Data Infrastructure (NSDI) and / or MSDI in support of Member States.
5. Inform IHO Member States of the benefits in forging links with other bodies (e.g. OGC, ISO TC211, IOC) to ensure IHO members are best placed to meet the developing challenge associated with data management and governance. Active support through capacity building will be explored where necessary.
6. Submit a Report to CHRIS by 31st December 2008.

Rules of Procedure

1. The Working Group on Marine Spatial Data Infrastructure Development is composed of Member States' representatives who have expressed their willingness to participate.
2. The Chairperson and Vice Chairperson shall be elected from its membership by correspondence. A Secretary will be nominated by the IHB Directing Committee.
3. The WG will have its permanent secretariat at the IHB, Monaco. The secretariat will provide administrative and secretarial support needed to gather, hold and disseminate information on behalf of the WG. The Secretary will provide a summary of the activities of the WG to be included in the IHO Annual Report.
4. The WG will normally work by correspondence. However, some visits and presentational meetings may be set (e.g. Attendance at Regional Hydrographic Commissions).
5. Decisions should generally be made by consensus. Voting, where required, will be taken by simple majority of WG Members.

**PRO 23 - A RESOLUTION ON ELECTRONIC NAVIGATIONAL CHART
COVERAGE, AVAILABILITY CONSISTENCY AND QUALITY**

Submitted by: Japan, Germany and South Africa

Reference: WEND Principle

The Conference is requested to approve the following Resolution:

The 17th International Hydrographic Conference,

Noting considerable increase in ENC coverage achieved in the past years,

Paying attention to comments from maritime stakeholders world-wide on ENCs,

Considering results of discussion in the WEND,

Noting also IMO considerations of mandatory carriage requirement of ECDIS,

Noting that still considerable efforts are required to satisfy the ENC coverage needed for mandatory ECDIS carriage,

Recognizing Member States' responsibility for acceleration in the production of ENCs to improve coverage,

Recognizing also necessity for developing cooperative relationship to improve the Member States' capability of producing ENCs,

Further recognizing importance of RHCs' initiative as the main role players in improving coverage and consistency,

Concludes that:

Member States should adhere and comply with the WEND Principles in order for the IHO, through its Member States, and the regional and worldwide bodies in which they come together, to achieve adequate coverage, availability, consistency and quality of ENCs by 2010.

**PRO 24 - RESOLUTION INVITING CONTRACTING PARTIES TO CONSIDER
THE ENTRY INTO FORCE OF THE PROTOCOL OF AMENDMENTS
TO THE CONVENTION AS A MATTER OF PRIORITY**

Submitted by: Germany, Norway, Denmark and Sweden

THE CONFERENCE,

REITERATING the great significance of the Protocol of Amendments to the Convention as an indispensable prerequisite for the modernization of the IHO,

NOTING with concern that until now only 13 Contracting Parties have approved the Protocol,

Strongly encourages the Contracting Parties to undertake all steps necessary to approve the Protocol as soon as possible,

Instructs the President of the IHB Directing Committee to inform the Contracting Parties via diplomatic channels about this resolution and to invite them to consider the entry into force of the Protocol as a matter of priority.

DECISIONS

CONTENTS

DECISION	RELEVANT PROPOSAL	DESCRIPTION	Page
A. DECISIONS OF THE CONFERENCE RESULTING FROM THE APPROVAL OF PROPOSALS SUBMITTED			
No.1	PRO 1	IHO Strategic Planning Working Group 2005-2006 (CONF.17/DOC.1)	95
No.2	PRO 2	Implementation Plan for New IHO Structure (CONF.17/DOC.1)	95
No.3	PRO 3	Amended IHO General Regulations (CONF.17/DOC.2)	96
No.4	PRO 4	Amended IHO Financial Regulations (CONF.17/DOC.3)	96
No.5	PRO 5	Rules of Procedure of the IHO Assembly (CONF.17/DOC.4)	96
No.6	PRO 6	Rules of Procedure of the IHO Council (CONF.17/DOC.5)	96
No.7	PRO 7	Rules of procedure of the IHO Finance Committee (CONF.17/DOC.6)	96
No.8	PRO 8	Re-structuring of IHO Committees and other Groups (CONF.17/DOC.1)	96
No.9	PRO 9	Advanced entry into force of the re-structuring of the IHO Committees and other Groups	96
No.10	PRO 10	Chairmanship of the HSSC and IRCC Committees	96
No.11	PRO 11	Actions for the implementation of the re-structuring of the IHO Committees and other Groups	97
No.12	PRO 12	Establishment of a Working Group to revise IHO Strategic Plan	97
No.13	PRO 13	Editorial Amendments to the Host Agreement	97
No.14	PRO 14	Amendments to Technical Resolution T1.1	97
No.15	PRO 16	Amendments to Article 6 of the General Regulations and to Rule 5 of the Rules of Procedure for IHO Conferences	99
No.16	PRO 17	Cancelling a Conference Decision	100
No.17	PRO 18	Provision of Regional Staff Officers for Capacity Building Effort	100
No.18	PRO 19	Establishment of a Working Group to study and propose a new edition of the IHB Staff Regulations	100
No.19	PRO 20	Establishment of a Working Group on Hydrography and Cartography of Inland Waters	101
No.20	PRO 23	Resolution on Electronic Navigational Chart Coverage Availability Consistency and Quality	101
No.21	PRO 21	Resolution on ENC Coverage in relation to ECDIS Carriage Requirements	102
No.22	PRO 22	Establishment of a Working Group on Marine Spatial Data Infrastructure Development	103
No.23	PRO 24	Encouragement of the approval of the Protocol of Amendments to the IHO Convention	103

B. DECISIONS OF THE CONFERENCE RELATED TO APPROVAL OF REPORTS SUBMITTED			
No.24		IHO Work programme 2008-2012 (CONF.17/REP/01 rev.1)	103
No.25		Report on the IHO Work Programme No. 1 for the period 2002-2007 (CONF.17/WP.1)	103
No.26		Report on the IHO Work Programme No. 2 for the period 2002-2007 (CONF.17/WP.2)	103
No.27		Report on the IHO Work Programme No. 3 for the period 2002-2007 (CONF.17/WP.3)	103
No.28		Report on the IHO Work Programme No. 4 for the period 2002-2007 (CONF.17/WP.4)	105
No.29		Report on the IHO Work Programme No. 5 for the period 2002-2007 (CONF.17/WP.5)	105
C. DECISIONS OF THE CONFERENCES RELATED TO FINANCE REPORTS			
No.30		Report of the Finance Committee (CONF.17/REP)	105
No.31		Finance Report for the period 2002-2006	105
No.32		The Five-Year Budget of the IHO 2008-2012 (CONF.17/F/02 rev.3)	105
No.33		Report on the IHO Budget for 2008 (CONF.17/F/03 rev.1)	105
No.34		Report of the Working Group on Salaries of the Secretary-General and Directors	105
D. MISCELLANEAOUS DECISIONS			
No.35		Report of the Eligibility Committee (CONF.17/E/REP)	106
No.36		New Directing Committee	106
No.37		Appointment of the external Auditor	106
No.38		Dates of the 4th Extraordinary International Hydrographic Conference - 2009	106
No.39		Seating order at the next Conference	106
No.40		Adoption of Resolution conveying IHO'S gratitude to the Government of Monaco	106
Resolution adopted by the XVIIth International Hydrographic Conference			107

**DECISIONS OF THE 17th INTERNATIONAL HYDROGRAPHIC CONFERENCE
CONCERNING THE PROPOSALS SUBMITTED**

**A. DECISIONS OF THE CONFERENCE RESULTING FROM THE APPROVAL
OF PROPOSALS SUBMITTED**

DECISION No. 1 (PRO 1) - IHO STRATEGIC PLANNING WORKING GROUP 2005-2006 (CONF.17/DOC.1)

The Conference noted the Report of the IHO Strategic Planning Working Group 2005-2006

DECISION No. 2 (PRO 2) - IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FOR NEW IHO STRUCTURE (CONF.17/DOC.1)

The Conference agreed with the implementation plan for the new IHO structure as follows:

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FOR NEW IHO STRUCTURE

Definition: DoA (Date of approval) is the date that two-thirds of the Member States have approved the amendments to the Convention in accordance with paragraph 3 of Article XXI of the Convention.

1. *Transition from Conference to Assembly*

- i) *The planning for EIHCs should schedule them two years after an IHC. The future dates of IHCs and EIHCs should thus be 2007, 2009, 2012, etc*
- ii) *If the DoA is more than 3 months before a Conference (whether an IHC or EIHC), then this Conference will become the 1st Assembly.*
- iii) *If the DoA is less than 3 months before a Conference, the 1st Assembly will be the next Conference (EIHC or IHC) scheduled after the one to be held within the immediate three month period. In this case, the Conference will initiate the selection of Council members and mandate the IHB/Secretariat to carry out the selection procedures through Circular Letter.*

2. *Establishment of the Council*

Two-thirds of the seats on Council will be allocated for regional representation; the remaining one-third of the seats will be based on hydrographic interest.

Member States not affiliated to a Regional Hydrographic Commission

To facilitate the full and fair representation of the interests of each IHO Member State, it is important that each Member State is a member of an RHC. The SPWG encourages all Member States to establish or join Regional Hydrographic Commissions.

3. *Transition of the International Hydrographic Bureau (IHB) to the Secretariat*

During the period between the DoA and three months after the 1st Assembly, the IHB shall have the authority required and shall adopt such measures as may be necessary for transition of the IHB to the Secretariat.

**DECISION No. 3 (PRO 3) - AMENDED IHO GENERAL REGULATIONS
(CONF.17/DOC.2)**

The Conference approved the text of the “IHO General Regulations” with the amendments proposed by Germany and France. The implementation of these Regulations will be subject to the entry into force of the amendments to the IHO Convention.

**DECISION No. 4 (PRO 4) - AMENDED IHO FINANCIAL REGULATIONS
(CONF.17/DOC.3)**

The Conference approved the text of the “IHO Financial Regulations”. The implementation of these Regulations will be subject to the entry into force of the amendments to the IHO Convention.

**DECISION No. 5 (PRO 5) - RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE IHO ASSEMBLY
(CONF.17/DOC.4)**

The Conference approved the text of the “IHO Rules of Procedure of the IHO Assembly” with the amendments proposed by Germany. The implementation of these Regulations will be subject to the entry into force of the amendments to the IHO Convention.

**DECISION N° 6 (PRO 6) - RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE IHO COUNCIL
(CONF.17/DOC.5)**

The Conference approved the text of the “IHO Rules of Procedure of the IHO Council” with the amendments proposed by Germany. The implementation of these Regulations will be subject to the entry into force of the amendments to the IHO Convention.

**DECISION No. 7 (PRO 7) - RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE IHO FINANCE
COMMITTEE (CONF.17/DOC.6)**

The Conference approved the text of the “IHO Rules of Procedure of the IHO Finance Committee” with the amendments proposed by Germany. The implementation of these Regulations will be subject to the entry into force of the amendments to the IHO Convention.

**DECISION No. 8 (PRO 8) - RE-STRUCTURING OF IHO COMMITTEES AND OTHER
GROUPS (CONF.17/DOC.1)**

The Conference approved the establishment of the IHO “HSSC “and “IRCC” in accordance with Annex I of the “Report of the IHO SPWG 2005-2006”, “Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure of HSSC and IRCC”. Further work to harmonize and complete the text will be carried out by the Chairmen of the CHRIS and CBC Committees in cooperation with the IHB.

**DECISION No. 9 (PRO 9) - ADVANCED ENTRY INTO FORCE OF THE RE-
STRUCTURING OF THE IHO COMMITTEES AND
OTHER GROUPS**

The Conference approved the date of 1st January 2009 at the latest for the entry into force of the restructuring of the IHO Committees and other Groups, as proposed by the SPWG.

**DECISION No. 10 (PRO 10) - CHAIRMANSHIP OF THE HSSC AND IRCC
COMMITTEES**

The Conference agreed that on 1 January 2009 at the latest, the Chairman of the existing CHRIS assumes the role of HSSC Chair, and the Chairman of the existing CBC assumes the role of IRCC Chair, until the new Chairs are elected by the Committees.

DECISION No. 11 (PRO 11) - ACTIONS FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RE-STRUCTURING OF THE IHO COMMITTEES AND OTHER GROUPS

The Conference agreed that the IHB, in consultation with the Chairmen of CHRIS and CBC, will take the appropriate actions for the implementation of the re-structuring of the IHO Committees and other Groups no later than 1st January 2009.

DECISION No. 12 (PRO 12) - ESTABLISHMENT OF A WORKING GROUP TO REVISE IHO STRATEGIC PLAN

The Conference established the *IHO Strategic Plan Working Group (ISPWG)* with the following characteristics:

Terms of Reference

Review the existing IHO Strategic Plan in view of IHO's new Vision, Mission and Objectives.

Prepare a revised draft strategic plan.

Present the draft Strategic Plan and any related recommendations to the Member States no later than 1 January 2009.

Composition

The Working Group will comprise representatives designated by the Regional Hydrographic Commissions. Individual Member States may be represented if they consider it necessary. The IHB shall be represented in the Working Group.

Chair

Chair: IGA G. Bessero (France)

*Vice-Chairs: Capt. De Haan (Netherlands)
Capt. Cavalheiro (Brazil)*

Working Method

The Working Group shall encourage maximum participation by working mainly by correspondence, using information technology, and with no more than two face-to-face meetings of the full membership.

DECISION No. 13 (PRO 13) - EDITORIAL AMENDMENTS TO THE HOST AGREEMENT

The Conference agreed to direct the President of the IHB, following approval of the amendments to the IHO Convention, to liaise with the Monegasque Government to make any necessary editorial amendments to the Host Agreement and to present the result to MS by Circular Letter.

DECISION No. 14 (PRO 14) - AMENDMENTS TO TECHNICAL RESOLUTION T1.1

The Conference approved the text of an amended Resolution T1.1, which will enter into force on 1 January 2009 and be cancelled after the entry into force of the amendments to the Convention.

T1.1 FORMATION OF IHO SUBSIDIARY ORGANS AND SUBORDINATE BODIES

- 1.- *Recognizing that the Convention, Article VI, paragraph 7, provides that the Conference shall constitute its own Committees and, further recognizing that Rules 21 and 22 of the Rules of Procedure for International Hydrographic Conferences outline the procedures for establishing subsidiary bodies deemed necessary for the performance of the functions of the Conference,*
- 2.- *Further recognizing the need to establish subsidiary bodies to carry out work of an ongoing nature in the intersessionary period between Conferences,*
- 3.- *Further recognizing the advantages to the IHO of making use of the special knowledge and experience that exists within Member States, in the hydrographic and associated fields,*
- 4.- *Resolves to establish intersessionary subsidiary bodies, additional to those that may be formed under Rule 21 of the Rules of Procedure for Hydrographic Conferences, to contribute to the work of the IHO and to the Bureau in particular. Such bodies are open to all Member States.*
- 5.- *The following types of subsidiary bodies may be established in accordance with the procedures specified in paragraph 6 below.*
 - a) *a committee, being a subsidiary organ whose life expectancy is longer than the time period between two consecutive ordinary sessions of the Conference;*
 - b) *sub-committee, being a subordinate body to a committee, whose life expectancy is longer than the time period between two consecutive ordinary sessions of the Conference; or*
 - c) *a working group, being a subordinate body formed to examine a particular subject.*
- 6.- *Procedures governing inter-sessionary subsidiary bodies*
 - a) *When establishing a subsidiary organ the Conference shall determine the Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure of that subsidiary organ, which shall clearly state, as a minimum, its objectives, its composition, the method for determining its chair, and its reporting procedures.*
 - b) *When proposing the establishment of a sub-committee, the Finance Committee or any subsidiary organ shall prepare draft Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure for that sub-committee, which shall clearly state, as a minimum, its objectives, its composition, the method for determining its chair, and its reporting procedures.*
 - c) *When proposing the establishment of a working group, the Finance Committee or any subsidiary organ shall determine and approve the Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure of that working group, which shall clearly state, as a minimum, its objectives, its composition, the method for determining its chair, and its reporting procedures.*
 - d) *Draft Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure prepared by the Finance Committee or any subsidiary organ in accordance with paragraph (ii) above shall be forwarded to the IHB who will:*
 - i. *submit them to Member States for approval by correspondence, or*
 - ii. *if such drafts are received one year or less before the opening day of the next ordinary session of the Conference, submit them to the Conference for approval.*

DECISION No. 15 (PRO 16) - AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 6 OF THE GENERAL REGULATIONS AND TO RULE 5 OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR IHO CONFERENCES

The Conference approved the following amendments to the Basic Documents regarding the participation of observers in IHO Conferences:

GENERAL REGULATIONS - ARTICLE 6

“The Directing Committee shall be authorized to invite observers from:

(a)”

Replace paragraphs (b) and (c):

- (b) International organizations whose activities are connected with those of the Bureau : one or exceptionally two observers each. A list of such organizations shall be notified by the Directing Committee to Member Governments in advance, so that they may have opportunity to raise objections or suggest additions.*
- (c) National organizations of Member Governments which have had or are likely to have occasion to collaborate with the Bureau, under the conditions prescribed in the preceding paragraph.*

So as to read:

- (b) Inter-governmental organizations with which an agreement or special arrangement has been made: one or exceptionally two observers each; and*
- (c) Non-governmental international organizations with which the Organization has established appropriate relationships in accordance with the Guidelines for the Accreditation of Non-governmental International Organizations: one or exceptionally two observers each.*

RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR IHO CONFERENCES, RULE 5, INVITATION TO OBSERVERS:

“The Bureau shall invite to be represented at any session of the Conference:

(a)

(b)”

Replace paragraphs (c) and (d):

- (c) Inter-governmental and non-governmental organizations whose activities are connected with those of the Bureau : one or exceptionally two observers each. A list of such organizations shall be notified by the Bureau to all Members so that they may have an opportunity to raise objections or suggest additions.*
- (d) National organizations of Members which have had or are likely to have occasion to collaborate with the Bureau, under the conditions prescribed in the preceding paragraph.*

So as to read:

- (c) *Inter-governmental organizations with which an agreement or special arrangement has been made: one or exceptionally two observers each; and*
- (d) *Non-governmental international organizations with which the Organization has established appropriate relationships in accordance with the Guidelines for the Accreditation of Non-governmental International Organizations: one or exceptionally two observers each.*

DECISION No. 16 (PRO 17) - CANCELLING A CONFERENCE DECISION

The Conference decided to cancel Decision N° 5 of the Second Extraordinary International Conference, which states that “The Conference decided to hold an Extraordinary International Hydrographic Conference between two ordinary Conferences”

The Conference also decided to hold an Extraordinary International Hydrographic Conference in 2009, which will consider the Report of the ISPWG (IHO Strategic Plan Working Group), the Report of the Working Group on Hydrography and Cartography of Inland Waters and the Progress on the Ratification of the Protocol of amendments to the Convention.

DECISION No. 17 (PRO 18) - PROVISION OF REGIONAL STAFF OFFICERS FOR CAPACITY BUILDING EFFORT

The Conference agreed to ask the CBC, in consultation with RHCs, to consider the part-time allocation of personnel to act as Regional Staff Officers to assist those chairmen of Regional Hydrographic Commissions (RHCs) who have limited human resources with which to sustain the capacity building effort in their regions. It is suggested that the priorities for provision of such a post should be EAthC, MACHC, NIOHC, SAIHC and SWPHC.

DECISION No. 18 (PRO 19) - ESTABLISHMENT OF A WORKING GROUP TO STUDY AND PROPOSE A NEW EDITION OF THE IHB STAFF REGULATIONS

The Conference established the *Staff Regulations Working Group* with the following Terms of Reference:

Terms of Reference

1. *Conduct a holistic review of the existing IHB Staff Regulations*
2. *Propose any changes to the Staff regulations necessary to administer the IHB effectively using consistent and internationally accepted procedures.*
3. *Propose any additional changes to the Staff regulations that would be necessary upon implementation of the new Secretariat organization.*
4. *To provide a Report on its work by Circular Letter to Member States in 2009.*

Chair and Vice Chair

Germany and UK respectively.

Membership

The Working Group is open to all Member States.

Member States wishing to participate should preferably provide representatives with relevant personnel administration experience.

The IHB will be represented in the Working Group.

Working Method

The Working Group shall encourage maximum participation by working mainly by correspondence using information technology, with face-to-face meetings of the full membership no more frequently than necessary.

DECISION No. 19 (PRO 20) - ESTABLISHMENT OF A WORKING GROUP ON HYDROGRAPHY AND CARTOGRAPHY OF INLAND WATERS

The Conference approved to ask CHRIS to establish a Working Group on Hydrography and Cartography of Inland Waters, to set its Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure noting the guidelines below and to report on its work to the 4th EIHC in 2009.

- The purpose of the Working Group will be to analyze and recommend the level and nature of IHO involvement in the Hydrography and Cartography of Inland Waterways.
- The Working Group should involve all relevant non-IHO international bodies in its deliberations, including the IEHG.

DECISION No. 20 (PRO 23) - RESOLUTION ON ELECTRONIC NAVIGATIONAL CHART COVERAGE AVAILABILITY CONSISTENCY AND QUALITY

The Conference approved the following Resolution:

The 17th International Hydrographic Conference,

- *Noting considerable increase in ENC coverage achieved in the past years,*
- *Paying attention to comments from maritime stakeholders world-wide on ENCs,*
- *Considering results of discussion in the WEND,*
- *Noting also IMO considerations of mandatory carriage requirement of ECDIS*
- *Noting that still considerable efforts are required to satisfy the ENC coverage needed for mandatory ECDIS carriage,*
- *Recognizing Member States' responsibility for acceleration in the production of ENCs to improve coverage,*
- *Recognizing also necessity for developing cooperative relationship to improve the Member States' capability of producing ENCs,*
- *Further recognizing importance of RHCs' initiative as the main role players in improving coverage and consistency,*

Concludes that:

Member States should adhere and comply with the WEND Principles in order for the IHO, through its 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.

DECISION No. 21 (PRO 21) - RESOLUTION ON ENC COVERAGE IN RELATION TO ECDIS CARRIAGE REQUIREMENTS

The Conference endorsed the following resolution:

The IHO

- *Realizing that even in the paper chart world, a complete coverage of high quality nautical charts does not exist.*
- *Furthermore realizing that it is not realistic to expect a complete world wide coverage of ENC's in all waters in the foreseeable future.*
- *Recognizing that shipping is more congested in some areas and routes around the world than others.*
- *Consequently also recognizes the need to identify congested areas and as a minimum ensure the earliest possible coverage of ENC's in those areas.*
- *Having considered the report from DNV on the "Effect of ENC Coverage on ECDIS Risk Reduction" establishing that:*
 - *a significant coverage of suitable ENC's are already available to the international shipping community, and*
 - *the implementation of ECDIS will enhance safety at sea, and*
 - *the implementation of ECDIS is found to be cost efficient for new as well as existing ships above a certain size.*
- *Noting that the Conference reaffirmed its commitments to the WEND Principles.*
- *Strongly supports the efforts by IMO to introduce mandatory carriage requirements for ECDIS, emphasizing that:*
 - *A significant coverage of ENC's is already in place and will be further improved by 2010, as indicated in the DNV report and supported by IHO assessments, and secondly that*
 - *Acceptance of mandatory carriage requirements will further accelerate the production of ENC's*

DECISION No. 22 (PRO 22) - ESTABLISHMENT OF A WORKING GROUP ON MARINE SPATIAL DATA INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT

The Conference decided to ask CHRIS to establish a Working Group on the Hydrographic Community inputs to National Spatial Data Infrastructures (NSDI), to set its Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure, noting the guidelines proposed (See Conference Document CONF.17/G02 Add.2 Page 4) and to report on its work to the 4th EIHC in 2009.

DECISION No. 23 (PRO 24) - ENCOURAGEMENT OF THE APPROVAL OF THE PROTOCOL OF AMENDMENTS TO THE IHO CONVENTION

The Conference,

Reiterating the great significance of the Protocol of Amendments to the Convention as an indispensable pre-requisite for the modernization of the IHO,

Noting that until now only 13 Contracting Parties have approved the Protocol

Strongly encourages the Contracting Parties to undertake all steps necessary to approve the Protocol as soon as possible

Instructs the President of the IHB Directing Committee to inform the Contracting Parties via diplomatic channels about this resolution and to invite them to consider the entry into force of the Protocol as a matter of priority.

B. DECISIONS OF THE CONFERENCE RELATED TO APPROVAL OF REPORTS SUBMITTED

DECISION No. 24 - IHO WORK PROGRAMME 2008-2012 (CONF.17/REP/01 rev.1))

The Conference approved the IHO Work Programme 2008 – 2012.

DECISION No. 25 - REPORT ON THE IHO WORK PROGRAMME No. 1, FOR THE PERIOD 2002-2007 (CONF.17/WP.1)

The Conference approved the Report on the IHO Work Programme No. 1, for the period 2002-2007.

DECISION No. 26 - REPORT ON THE IHO WORK PROGRAMME No. 2, FOR THE PERIOD 2002-2007 (CONF.17/WP.2)

The Conference approved the Report on the IHO Work Programme No. 2, for the period 2002-2007.

DECISION No. 27 - REPORT ON THE IHO WORK PROGRAMME No. 3, FOR THE PERIOD 2002-2007 (CONF.17/WP.3)

The Conference approved the Report on the IHO Work Programme No. 3, for the period 2002-2007, including the following amendments, endorsements and decisions:

- A. Report of the Worldwide Electronic Navigational Chart Data Base (WEND) Committee
- B. Report of the Committee on Hydrographic Requirements for Information Systems (CHRIS)
- C. Report of the Transfer Standard Maintenance and Applications Development Working Group (TSMAD)
- D. Report of the Colours and Symbols Maintenance Working Group (C&SMWG)
- E. Report of the Chart Standardization and Paper Chart Working Group (CSPCWG)
- F. Report of the Standardization of Nautical Publications Working Group (SNPWG)
- G. Report of the Data Protection Scheme Working Group (DPSWG)
- H. Report of the IHO-IEC Harmonization Group on Marine Information Objects (HGMIO)
- I. Report on the work on the Publication on Limits of Oceans and Seas (S-23)
- J. Report of the Committee on the Hydrographic Dictionary (S-32)
- K. Report of the Working Group on Standards for Hydrographic Surveys (S-44)
- L. Report of the IHO Tidal Committee (TC)

The TC Report included the following amendment to Resolution A 6.8.

IHO Resolution A 6.8.

Change the text to read as follows:

A 6.8 NATIONAL TIDAL CONSTITUENT BANKS

- iv) *Listing of values for tidal constituents giving amplitudes in metres and Greenwich phase lags in degrees and designation of organization responsible for analysis. (Tidal constituents used should form part of those in the Standard List prepared by the IHOTC and published on the IHO website.)*

See also A 6.1, A 6.2

- M. Report of the IHO Manual on Hydrography Working Group (MoHWG)
- N. Report on Training, including relationship with IMA
- O. Report of the FIG/IHO/ICA International Advisory Board on Standards of Competence for Hydrographic Surveyors and Nautical Cartographers (IAB)

The approval of the IAB Report included the following specific endorsements:

- a) *The Conference endorsed the FIG/IHO/ICA Advisory Board on Standards of Competence for Hydrographic Surveyors and Nautical Cartographers's investigation of a process for recognition of national, regional, or industrial schemes of individual certification, and the preparation of standards for such individual certification schemes.*
 - b) *The Conference endorsed the development by the IHO/ICA Advisory Board on Standards of Competence for Hydrographic Surveyors and Nautical Cartographers of new cost-recovery mechanisms for partial funding of critical activities of the IAB.*
- P. Report of the Joint IHO-IOC Guiding Committee for the General Bathymetric Chart of the Oceans (GEBCO)

The Conference welcomed the new Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure submitted by GEBCO, but was not in a position to endorse them, as some inconsistencies were found in the proposed text. It was then decided to request GEBCO more details about the proposed Terms of References and Rules of Procedure and further harmonization of the texts before endorsing them. The procedure will be followed by Circular Letter.

- Q. Report of the Sub-Committee on Digital Bathymetry (SCDB)
- R. Report of the Sub-Committee on Undersea Feature Names (SCUFN)
- S. Report of the IHO Data Center for Digital Bathymetry (DCDB)
- T. Report of the Advisory Board on Hydrographic, Geodetic and Marine Geo-Scientific aspects of the Law of the Sea (ABLOS)
- U. Report of the IHO Commission on Promulgation of Radio Navigational Warnings (CPRNW)

DECISION No. 28 - REPORT ON THE IHO WORK PROGRAMME No. 4, FOR THE PERIOD 2002-2007 (CONF.17/WP.4)

The Conference approved the Report on the IHO Work Programme No. 4, for the period 2002-2007.

DECISION No. 29 - REPORT ON THE IHO WORK PROGRAMME No. 5, FOR THE PERIOD 2002-2007 (CONF.17/WP.5)

The Conference approved the Report on the IHO Work Programme No. 5, for the period 2002-2007.

C. DECISIONS OF THE CONFERENCE RELATED TO FINANCES REPORTS

DECISION No. 30 - REPORT OF THE FINANCE COMMITTEE (CONF.17/F/REP)

The Conference approved the Report of this Committee.

DECISION No. 31 - FINANCE REPORT FOR THE PERIOD 2002 – 2006 (CONF.17/F/01 rev.1)

The Conference approved this Report.

DECISION No. 32 - REPORT OF THE FIVE-YEAR BUDGET OF THE IHO 2008-2012 (CONF.17/F/02 rev. 3)

The Conference approved this Report with proposed amendments.

DECISION No. 33 - REPORT OF THE IHO BUDGET FOR 2008 (CONF.17/F/03 rev.1)

The Conference approved this Report.

DECISION No. 34 - REPORT OF THE WORKING GROUP ON SALARIES OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL AND DIRECTORS (CONF.17/F/04 rev.1)

The Conference approved this Report with proposed amendments.

D. MISCELLANEOUS DECISIONS

**DECISION No. 35 - REPORT OF THE ELIGIBILITY COMMITTEE
(CONF.17/E/REP)**

The Conference approved the Report of this Committee

DECISION No. 36 - NEW DIRECTING COMMITTEE

The Conference elected the following as members of the new Directing Committee :

- Vice Admiral Alexandros MARATOS (Greece) - President
- Captain Hugo GORZIGLIA (Chile) - Director I.
- Captain Robert WARD (Australia) - Director II

DECISION No. 37 - APPOINTMENT OF THE EXTERNAL AUDITOR

The Conference approved the re-appointment of the present Auditor (Cabinet Morel) for the next five-year period.

DECISION No. 38 - DATES OF THE 4th EXTRAORDINARY INTERNATIONAL HYDROGRAPHIC CONFERENCE - 2009

The Conference agreed to hold the Fourth Extraordinary I.H. Conference in the first week of June 2009. The dates will be announced to Member States after the IHB D.C. consultation with the Monegasque Government.

DECISION No. 39 - SEATING ORDER AT THE NEXT CONFERENCE

It was established that the order of seating at the 4th EIHC would commence with the letter **"W"**.

DECISION No. 40 - ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION CONVEYING IHO'S GRATITUDE TO THE GOVERNMENT OF MONACO

A Conference Resolution was adopted conveying IHO's profound gratitude to HSH Prince Albert II and to the Government of Monaco for the kind hospitality extended to the Organization.

**RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE
XVIIth INTERNATIONAL HYDROGRAPHIC CONFERENCE**

"The Conference:

Recognizing the continued close association and significant support of His Serene Highness Prince ALBERT II and the Government of the Principality of Monaco in Hosting the International Hydrographic Organization,

Appreciating the kind generosity of His Serene Highness and the Government of the Principality of Monaco in providing premises for the Organization, particularly the magnificent new quarters completed in September 1996,

Further appreciating the provision of the Auditorium RAINIER III in Monaco for the XVIIth International Hydrographic Conference and its associated Exhibitions,

Further appreciating the provision of the Port Facilities of Monaco for the three ships that were placed on exhibition during the XVIIth International Hydrographic Conference,

Expresses its profound gratitude to His Serene Highness Prince ALBERT II and the Government of the Principality of Monaco for their graciousness and kind hospitality extended to the Organization, and

Requests the delegation of the Principality of Monaco to convey to His Serene Highness and the Government of the Principality of Monaco the sincere sentiments of the Conference expressed above."

FINANCE COMMITTEE

CHAIRMAN: **Mr. Maurice GAZIELLO (Monaco)**

VICE-CHAIRMAN: **Mr. Alan MAIDMENT (United Kingdom)**

RAPPORTEUR: **Ms. Christine MEYNADIER (IHB)**

CONTENTS

Item	Page
1ST FINANCE COMMITTEE SESSION	
Finance Report 2002-2006 (Agenda item A)	111
Proposed IHO Five-Year Budget for 2008-2012 (Agenda item B)	114
IHO Budget for 2008 (Agenda item C)	117
Report of the Finance Committee working group on the salary scheme for the Secretary General and Directors (Agenda item D)	117
2nd FINANCE COMMITTEE SESSION	
Consideration of the Report of the Finance Committee Working Group on Salary Scheme for Secretary General and Directors under the new structure of the IHO (<u>continued</u>) (Agenda item D)	119
Appointment of the external Auditor (Agenda item E)	119

SUMMARY RECORDS**CONF.17/F/SR.1****1st FINANCE
COMMITTEE SESSION****5 May 2007****0900-1230****Rapporteur : Ms. Christine MEYNADIER (IHB)**CONTENTS

- Finance Report 2002-2006 (Agenda item A)
- Proposed IHO Five-Year Budget for 2008-2012 (Agenda item B)
- IHO Budget for 2008 (Agenda item C)
- Report of the Finance Committee working group on the salary scheme for the Secretary General and Directors (Agenda item D)

The CHAIRMAN opened the meeting and welcomed delegates.

FINANCE REPORT 2002-2006 (CONF.17/F/01 Rev.1) (Agenda item A)

The PRESIDENT OF THE DIRECTING COMMITTEE said that the Directing Committee had given the highest priority to ensuring the strict control and administration of the Organization's finances; a monthly financial reporting system detailing monthly income and expenditure had been established in order to facilitate the better conduct and monitoring of finances.

Introducing the report of the Directing Committee on the administration of the finances of the Organization for the period 1 January 2002 to 31 December 2006, he drew attention to some of the salient points, including success in keeping the unit share value low; alignment of the salaries of the Directors, Category A staff and Translators with the United Nations pay scale and approval of the alignment by Member States; the action taken to reduce the exposure of the Internal Retirement Fund to market volatility; action taken to accommodate long distance travel not forecast in the five-year budget; and success in negotiating increases in interest earned on bank accounts. He thanked Member States for generally paying their contributions promptly throughout the period. Overall, the Organization's financial position was satisfactory.

The CHAIRMAN noted the sound financial health of the Organization, the success in keeping the share value low, the steady increase in the number of shares and consequent rise in revenues, and the budget surpluses generated in each year of the period. The only item of concern had been the exposure of investments of the Internal Retirement Fund, but measures taken from 2002 had returned the Fund to a sound footing.

Rear Admiral ANDREASEN (United States of America) thanked the Directing Committee and the Finance Committee Officers for their management of the Organization's finances in the 2002-2006 period. Their success in holding the share value increase well below projections was much appreciated.

He requested two clarifications. In paragraph 3.1.7 of the report, it was not clear whether the home rental allowance had been scrapped completely or was simply not being paid out. Secondly, he would appreciate more details about the changes made to the long-distance travel criteria.

The PRESIDENT OF THE DIRECTING COMMITTEE confirmed that the house rental allowance was still in existence, but no staff member was currently eligible to receive it. The Staff Regulations required the Directing Committee to set criteria for long distance travel. Until 2005 the Directing Committee had made the decisions on a case-by-case basis. Then, following consultation with the International Maritime Organization and some Member States, the Committee had introduced a policy that trips exceeding eight hours from the final point of departure in Europe to the mission destination would be eligible for business class travel, resulting in an estimated increase in travel costs of about 5 per cent of the travel expenditure.

Rear Admiral ANDREASEN (United States of America) said that in his country a fourteen hour threshold was applied for entitlement to business class travel. He suggested publishing the long distance travel criteria in the Staff Regulations.

The PRESIDENT OF THE DIRECTING COMMITTEE explained that it was not practicable to republish the Staff Regulations every time an amendment was made. The long distance travel policy had been circulated in a staff memorandum, which was available to all Member States.

Mr. John SPITTAL (New Zealand) asked at what point a Member State which had not paid its contributions for many years ceased to be considered a Member of the Organization.

The PRESIDENT OF THE DIRECTING COMMITTEE replied that any Member Government which was two years in arrears in its contributions was denied all rights and benefits conferred by the Convention. It could participate in meetings but did not have the right to vote until such time as the outstanding contributions had been paid. The Directing Committee was in regular contact with suspended States, actively seeking ways of restoring them to full membership.

The CHAIRMAN said the Finance Committee's encouraging Member States in arrears to pay their contributions had clearly borne fruit. Contributions paid amounted to around 88 per cent of those due, a high figure compared with some other comparable organizations.

IGA Gilles BESSERO (France) commended the Directing Committee on its good financial management during the period under review. On the matter of long distance travel, in France the length of the flight was not the only criterion for determining the class of travel, for official purposes; the length of a mission was also taken into consideration. He expressed his regret that the tables in document CONF.17/F/01 Rev.1 had not been made available in both the official languages of the Organization.

The PRESIDENT OF THE DIRECTING COMMITTEE apologized for the failure to provide the tables in French.

Expenditure on long distance travel for the five-year period under review had amounted to 930,000 euros, an overspend of seven per cent compared with the 887,000 euros approved by Member States in the annual budget approval exercises, or 20 per cent compared with the amount of 773,000 euros approved by the XVIth Conference in 2002. The main reasons for the overspend were the new policy on long distance travel; the meetings that had taken place as a consequence of establishing the Strategic Planning Working Group and the Capacity Building Committee; and various extraordinary meetings, for example, in the wake of the tsunami in the Indian Ocean.

He thanked Member States, especially the United Kingdom, France and Germany, for providing representation at certain meetings for the Bureau and for IHO at no cost to the Organization.

Mr. FARIS (United States of America) expressed his appreciation for the helpful explanatory information in the report. He asked how salaries of directors and staff would be aligned with the United Nations salary scale, and what impact actions by the Monaco civil service would have on the evolution of salaries over time.

The CHAIRMAN replied that the salary scale had been aligned with that of the United Nations in accordance with the decision of the XVIth Conference, but that a number of modifications had been made to comply with the recommendations of the Finance Committee Working Group. Those modifications were set out in paragraph 3.1.1 of the report.

The PRESIDENT OF THE DIRECTING COMMITTEE explained that Global Consulting Services (GCS), had been engaged by the Bureau to evaluate the IHB posts on the basis of job descriptions and qualifications, and to make proposals accordingly. The working group had accepted its proposals in general, but had recommended lowering the rates of pay for directors, Category A staff and translators by one level each. The second element in the alignment of salaries was the post adjustment factor which was set each month by the United Nations to take account of movements in the cost of living and in dollar exchange rates for various locations. The working group had recommended that the post adjustment factor should be applied only at the time of the appointment or reappointment of staff (departing from United Nations practice) and that salaries should be adjusted on the basis of the cost of living figures reported twice a year by the Monaco authorities. Bonuses had ceased to be paid, in accordance with United Nations practice. The proposals of the working group as set out in Finance Committee Circular Letter 5/2003 had been approved by over two-thirds of Member States and were now in force.

Ms. HERING (Germany) commended the Bureau on its good management of the budget, which had left the Organization in a sound financial position for the coming five-year period. Her delegation was satisfied with the report as it stood and the outcomes reflected in it, including the arrangements in place with regard to long distance travel and salaries.

Rear Admiral ANDREASEN (United States of America) said that the transfer to the Capacity Building Fund of receipts from Member States had come as a surprise, since the Fund was intended to consist of voluntary contributions. After a lengthy debate, the XIIIth Conference had concluded, in decision No. 38, that 1.5 per cent of funds could be set aside for technical assistance in 1983. To his knowledge, that figure still stood. He was aware that the funds transferred during the previous five-year period had remained below 1.5 per cent and he wished to draw attention to the limit which, unless changed by the Conference, continued to apply. He proposed that voluntary contributions and monies transferred from Member States' contributions should be shown as two separate budget lines.

The PRESIDENT OF THE DIRECTING COMMITTEE said that there would be no difficulty in allowing for two separate budget lines covering, respectively, budget allocations for the Capacity Building Fund and external donations to the Fund. In 1982, 1.5% of the budget had been allocated to capacity building (approved as Technical Assistance) for the subsequent year. The same figure had been allocated since then on an annual basis, and had in fact been exceeded in some instances in the past in response to capacity building needs. The increase had been covered by voluntary contributions and amounts transferred from the budget surplus. The corresponding activities were reflected in the Work Programme and communicated to Member States. The actual percentage was not expressly mentioned in the budget, but could be included if the Finance Committee so decided.

Captain GORZIGLIA (Director IHB), speaking as Chairman of the Capacity Building Committee, recalled that, in 1982, when capacity building first emerged as an important issue, the decision was taken to allocate 1.5% of the budget for 1983 to those activities. The situation had since evolved, and the matter was now considered not in terms of a fixed percentage of the budget, but rather in terms of the Organization's objectives, the tasks to be carried out and the resources required to meet those needs. He recalled the establishment of the Capacity Building Committee and of the IHO Capacity Building Fund. It was clear from the relevant administrative resolution that there was not a dual

budget base for capacity building activities: an annual budget allocation and voluntary contributions. Regional Hydrographic Commissions had begun to identify needs and submit requests, and the Capacity Building Committee had proposed a Work Programme in response to those needs.

Rear Admiral ANDREASEN (United States of America) reaffirmed his Government's support for capacity building. The original intention had been to fund the capacity building programme from voluntary contributions. Surplus budget funds arising from sound management and increased dues should not be used to supplement the Capacity Building Fund without the prior approval of the Member States.

The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to approve the Finance Report 2002-2006.

The report was approved.

**PROPOSED IHO FIVE-YEAR BUDGET 2008-2012 (CONF.17/F/02 rev.2;
CONF.17/REP/01Rev.1)
(Agenda item B)**

The PRESIDENT OF THE DIRECTING COMMITTEE, introducing the proposed five-year budget for 2008-2012 (CONF.17/F/02.rev.2), said that the Directing Committee's primary concern in preparing the budget had been to apply the principle of no increase in the unit share value, as described in paragraph 1.1 of the document. Even the minimal increases anticipated in 2011 and 2012 could be avoided if the Organization's financial position so permitted. The four sections of the budget document covered:

- Income, including Member States' contributions and interest on bank accounts;
- Expenditure, comprising personnel costs, current operating costs and capital expenditure;
- Funds, comprising allocations to the GEBCO Fund, the Printing Fund, the Renovation Fund, the Conference Fund, the Directors' Removal Fund and the Capacity Building Fund; and
- Tables for the proposed budgets, including pie charts.

Mr. FARIS (United States of America) welcomed the IHB's responsible and prudent management of resources, and the efforts made to maintain the level of the unit share value and avoid future increases. Regarding personnel costs and the alignment of salaries on those of the United Nations salary scheme, it was his understanding that salaries would be aligned with those of the United Nations at a particular point in time, and that the proposal of the Finance Committee Working Group (FCWG) on salaries was for periodic salary increases, with projected inflation factored in, in lieu of post adjustment.

The PRESIDENT OF THE DIRECTING COMMITTEE confirmed that salaries would be established at the time of appointment, or re-appointment on the results of an external competition, at the applicable United Nations pay scale at the D-1, P-4 and P-1 levels, taking into account the Monaco post adjustment factor and the expected annual 1.5% inflation rate increase as applied to the Civil Service in Monaco. Within the five-year budget period, promotion would be based on existing tables in the Staff Regulations which, for Directors, would mean an increase of some 3% after three years.

IGA BESSERO noted, with regard to income, that the statement in paragraph 1 of the budget document to the effect that there had been an increase in 2% in the unit share value over the previous eight years somewhat weakened the grounds for an anticipated 4.5% increase over the coming five-year period.

On the subject of expenditure, it was difficult to approve a five-year budget for a Work Programme that had not yet been adopted. Furthermore, the budget as proposed was based on the explicit assumption that there would be no structural change during the budget period. That assumption might have a negative effect on the expeditious ratification of the Protocol of Amendments to the Convention by Member States. The impact on the budget of anticipated structural changes in the

Directing Committee and in the conference system should be addressed. Noting recent difficulties, he further asked whether the number of translation staff was adequate to cope with the workload of document translation into the working languages.

The PRESIDENT OF THE DIRECTING COMMITTEE replied that no major difficulties were anticipated with regard to the consequences of structural changes. Any problems would be dealt with as they arose. He drew attention to the pie charts at the end of the budget document, showing projected cost distribution per programme. The plenary meeting would deal with any budgetary implications when considering subsequent items on the agenda.

The CHAIRMAN confirmed that such matters would be discussed under agenda item D, but since the adoption of the structural change proposals could not be relied upon, their implications could not have been included in the budget now proposed.

The PRESIDENT OF THE DIRECTING COMMITTEE added that, in examining the proposals of the FCWG on salaries, consideration would be given to ways of absorbing any additional costs, certainly without any increase in contributions. As to the recommended structural changes in the frequency and type of meetings, the resulting situation would no doubt be more favourable financially than in the past, and could be accommodated within the budget.

Dr. NARAYANAN (Canada) commended the clear budget presentation and expressed support for the proposed budget.

Commander KLEPSVIK (Norway) recalled that the SPWG structural change proposals had been adopted at the Third Extraordinary International Hydrographic Conference in 2005 on the understanding that they would entail no budgetary increase.

Rear Admiral ANDREASEN (United States of America), returning to the question of funding for capacity building, said that the SPWG report had led to some confusion. Although provision was indeed made for the Capacity Building Fund to be based partly on ordinary annual contributions and partly on voluntary resources, the progressive movement of budget resources into that Fund went beyond the original intention of a 1.5% limit.

There were two causes for concern in the proposed budget: the significant increase in expenditure on long-distance travel, and the diversion of funds to capacity building.

Captain IBARRA (Chile) commended the proposed budget. However, he agreed with the representative of France that the proposals should reflect the possibility that there might be changes in the structure of the IHO requiring ratification by Member States. The financial proposals should also be consistent with the 2008-2012 Work Programme. The proposed budget could not be approved without taking those aspects into account. As regards capacity building, it was important to note that not all countries had the same opportunities.

IGA BESSERO (France) proposed that, in order not to delay the ratification of any structural changes, the proposed budget should be amended to include a reference to the decision mentioned by the representative of Norway, namely, that the changes should not have financial implications, or should at worst incur cost increases that could be absorbed under the current budget proposals. It would be difficult to approve the allocations for capacity building in the 2008-2012 Work Programme before dealing with the relevant activities in the plenary sessions of the XVIIth Conference.

The CHAIRMAN said that the financial implications of the proposed structural changes, which had a bearing on the consequential salary adjustments, were not reflected in the proposed budget. They were, however, shown in document CONF.17/F/04, the report of the Finance Committee Working Group on Salaries of the Secretary-General and Directors, which would be considered under agenda item D.

The PRESIDENT OF THE DIRECTING COMMITTEE said that the Working Group had concluded that there would be little or no financial impact of the proposed structural changes if they were implemented during the period 2008-2012, and that any measures needed to permit adjustments to the proposed budget would be introduced subsequently. He agreed that it would be useful to amend the proposed budget along the lines suggested by the representative of France.

Commander KLEPSVIK (Norway) supported the amendment proposed by the representative of France, which would clarify the situation. It should be noted that there would be no financial implications until the new structure, if approved, became operational on 1 January 2009.

Dr. NARAYANAN (Canada) said that there should be a specific budget allocation for capacity building, to act as seed money for attracting voluntary funds. The Finance Committee should approve such an allocation in principle, and the actual amount would be determined during consideration of the Work Programme in the plenary sessions of the XVIIth Conference.

Captain GORZIGLIA (Director IHB) pointed out that capacity building was an important activity, and that the revised allocations before the Committee had been arrived at on the basis of comments received from Member States on the draft proposals sent to them. Obviously it was difficult to approve the proposed budget in isolation, and the proposals should therefore be read alongside those for the 2008-2012 Work Programme. The latter indicated that the allocations for capacity building were intended for clearly identified activities in the years concerned, and had been proposed on the basis of suggestions made by Member States. The 1982 decision to allocate 1.5% of the 1983 budget for capacity building activities (under Technical Assistance) should be regarded as approval of an increase over prior expenditure in that area, rather than an absolute figure; capacity building activities had certainly been undertaken before then, even if they had not been designated as such. The current proposals represented 2.35% of Member States' contributions.

Mr. FARIS (United States of America) endorsed the view expressed by the representative of Canada that the situation regarding the funding of capacity building should be clarified. He also agreed that the budget should be shaped alongside consideration of programme strategies.

Rear Admiral ANDREASEN (United States of America) said that the proceedings of the 1982 Conference indicated that the proposal to undertake capacity building activities, submitted by the Philippines, had been for new and extended activities for which only a nominal figure of "10 gold francs" had been allocated previously. In other words, the 1.5% allocation was an absolute figure rather than an increase.

The CHAIRMAN confirmed that the proposed budget reflected an allocation to capacity building activities in excess of 1.5%. He suggested that the Finance Committee should recommend the proposals submitted to it, on the understanding that, if amendments were required as a consequence of the decisions taken by the Conference on the Work Programme, they would be submitted for approval at that time.

The PRESIDENT OF THE DIRECTING COMMITTEE suggested that the budget proposals should be amended to indicate that the Finance Committee recommended that the allocation for capacity building activities should not exceed 1.5% of the total budget. Additional allocations might be considered during discussion of the Work Programme in the plenary sessions of the Conference.

IGA BESSERO (France) said that the Chairman's proposal best reflected the wish of the Committee.

Rear Admiral ANDREASEN (United States of America) said he could not support the Chairman's proposal.

In reply to a request for clarification from Commander KLEPSVIK (Norway), the CHAIRMAN confirmed that the budget proposals would be amended to include a reference to the 2003 decision that changes to the structure of the IHO should have neutral financial implications, or should only

give rise to cost increases that could be absorbed under the current budget proposals. He suggested that the resulting recommendations for the five-year budget of the IHO 2008-2012 should be submitted to the plenary sessions of the XVIIth Conference, with an indication that the United States of America had opposed the proposals.

It was so decided.

CONSIDERATION OF THE IHO 2008 BUDGET (CONF.17/F/03) (Agenda item C)

The PRESIDENT OF THE DIRECTING COMMITTEE introduced the proposed IHO budget for 2008 (document CONF.17/F/03). As indicated in the proposed budget for 2008-2012, the budget for 2008 was based on 670 shares, with no increase in the unit share value compared with 2007. In accordance with the Financial Regulations, the proposals had been submitted for preliminary consideration by the Finance Committee.

Rear Admiral ANDREASEN (United States of America) objected to the proposals. They presented the same difficulties as the five-year proposals.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that the recommendations for the 2008 budget should be submitted to the plenary sessions of the XVIIth Conference, indicating the objection made by the United States of America delegation.

It was so decided.

CONSIDERATION OF THE REPORT OF THE FINANCE COMMITTEE WORKING GROUP ON SALARIES OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL AND DIRECTORS (CONF.17/F/04 and CONF.17/F/05) (Agenda item D)

Mr. MAIDMENT (United Kingdom), Chairman of the Finance Committee Working Group on Salaries of the Secretary-General and Directors, presented the report of the Working Group (document CONF.17/F/04), which had met from 24 to 25 July 2006. The approach taken by the Working Group had been governed by the guidelines provided in the mandate approved by Member States. The Working Group had considered the applicability of the United Nations salary structure to the new regime, which took account of information on the salary structure of three similar international organizations. The Working Group had concluded that a pay differential should be established between the Secretary-General and the Directors to reflect the differences in their roles and responsibilities, and that the United Nations salary system should be applied, including changes in the post-adjustment factor at the time of promulgation, to the salaries for the relevant posts with effect from the implementation of the new administrative structure. The salary for the Secretary-General should be equivalent to that for a United Nations Assistant Secretary General, and that for the Directors should remain at United Nations grade D1. The grading should be independently reviewed once job descriptions had been agreed by Member States and adjusted if necessary. The allocation to be used by the Secretary-General in meeting the costs of representational requirements should be shown as part of the IHO total budgetary requirement, not as a personal allowance. Expenditure related to the daily operation of the IHO, e.g. mobile telephone costs, should also be funded from the approved budget. The changes should not result in any increase in contributions from Member States.

The CHAIRMAN drew attention to document CONF.17/F/05, which reproduced a letter received from France in response to Circular Letter 63/2006 on the salary scheme. The document also contained the responses given to the questions raised by the delegation of France, providing additional information on the financial impact of the proposed salaries scheme.

Mr. FARIS (United State of America) requested clarification on the application of the post-adjustment factor.

Mr. MAIDMENT (United Kingdom), Chairman of the Finance Committee Working Group on Salaries of the Secretary-General and Directors, said that in 2003 the Working Group had recommended that salaries should be aligned with the United Nations salaries scale at the time of appointment or reappointment to a post, but that in intervening years increases should correspond to those applied to the civil service in Monaco, which related to the local rate of inflation. The new recommendation was to align the salaries with those of the United Nations scale throughout, with no reference to the local rate of inflation. In reply to a question from Mr. FARIS (United States of America), he said that the system would operate as shown in the third table in document CONF.17/F/05, entitled "Impact of the recommendations of 2006 WG".

Mr. FARIS (United States of America) asked whether the United Nations grades chosen had been selected on the basis of job descriptions and, if so, why the Working Group had thought it necessary to have the grades reviewed, and how likely it was that the posts would be upgraded.

Mr. MAIDMENT (United Kingdom), Chairman of the Finance Committee Working Group on Salaries of the Secretary-General and Directors, said that, in recommending the grades, the Working Group had taken into consideration the current job descriptions of the Directors, and had assumed that a future Secretary-General would take on an executive role with considerably greater responsibilities, the Directors playing a supporting role. It had concluded that there should be a difference in salary equivalent to two levels in the United Nations salary scale, with the Secretary-General's post at Assistant Secretary-General level and the Directors at D1. The proposed independent review, which would be undertaken once the new job descriptions had been refined, would determine whether that was a reasonable conclusion.

The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to approve the recommendations made by the Working Group.

Mr. FARIS (United States of America) requested time for consideration of the proposals. He proposed that the Committee should take a decision at its second session.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN adjourned the session.

CONF.17/F/SR.2

**2nd FINANCE
COMMITTEE SESSION**

5 May 2007

1400-1430

Rapporteur: Ms. Christine MEYNADIER (IHB)

CONTENTS

- Consideration of the Report of the Finance Committee Working Group on Salary Scheme for Secretary General and Directors under the new structure of the IHO (continued) (Agenda item D)
 - Appointment of the external Auditor (Agenda item E)
-

CONSIDERATION OF THE REPORT OF THE FINANCE COMMITTEE WORKING GROUP ON THE SALARY SCHEME FOR SECRETARY GENERAL AND DIRECTORS UNDER THE NEW STRUCTURE OF THE IHO (CONF/17/F/04) (Agenda item D) (continued)

Mr. FARIS (United States of America) said that recommendation (d) of the working group implied that the agreement of Member States would be sought before any change from the recommended grading was considered by the GCS. In order to make that clear, he proposed that the words “by the Member States” be deleted from the first sentence of the recommendation, and another sentence be inserted before the last one, reading: “In the event that agreement on job descriptions necessitates adjustment to the gradings recommended by the working group in this report, the working group will reconvene to consider the adjusted gradings and recommend whether the Member States should adopt the adjusted gradings.”

Commander KLEPSVIK (Norway), while agreeing to the proposed amendment, pointed out that a new working group with a specific mandate to consider the adjusted gradings would have to be convened, and that the wording should be changed accordingly.

The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to approve the report of the working group, as amended.

It was so agreed.

APPOINTMENT OF THE EXTERNAL AUDITOR

The PRESIDENT OF THE DIRECTING COMMITTEE said that he supported the offer of the present external Auditor to continue in that capacity. Cooperation had been excellent, and the Auditor had contributed substantially to the work of the IHB.

The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to approve renewal of the appointment of the current Auditor.

Renewal of the appointment was approved.

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

There was none.

The Chairman closed the Session at 1430.

PLENARY SESSIONS

PRESIDENT: Dr. Wyn WILLIAMS (United Kingdom)

VICE-PRESIDENT: Dr. Savithri NARAYANAN (Canada)

CONTENTS

FIRST PLENARY SESSION	
Confirmation of the election of the President and election of the Vice-President of the Conference	125
Election of the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Finance Committee	126
Establishment of the Eligibility Committee	126
Appointment of Rapporteurs	126
Appointment of Scrutineers	126
Submission of new proposals	126
Adoption of the Agenda	127
Approval of the Table of Tonnages	127
Opening Ceremony	127
SECOND PLENARY SESSION	
Consideration of Proposals (Agenda item 3)	129
Additional Proposals	129
- PRO 1- Noting of the Report on the Strategic Planning Working Group	129
- PRO 2 - Approval of an Implementation Plan for the new IHO structure	130
- PRO 3 - Approval of the Amended IHO General Regulations	130
- PRO 4 - Approval of the Amended IHO Financial Regulations	133
- PRO 5 - Approval of the Rules of Procedure of the IHO Assembly	134
- PRO 6 - Approval of the Rules of Procedure of the IHO Council	135
- PRO 7 - Approval of the Rules of Procedure of the IHO Finance Committee	135
- PRO 2 - Approval of an Implementation Plan for the new IHO structure (resumed)	136
- PRO 3 - Approval of the Amended IHO General Regulations (resumed)	137
Additional Proposals (resumed)	137

THIRD PLENARY SESSION	
Consideration of Proposals (Agenda item 3) (continued)	137
- PRO 2 - Approval of an Implementation Plan for the new IHO Structure (continued)	138
- PRO 8 - Approval of the Re-structuring of IHO Committees and Other Groups (PRO 8)	139
- PRO 9 - Advanced entry into force of the Re-structuring of IHO Committees and Other Groups	141
- PRO 10 - Chairmanship of HSCC and IRCC Committees (PRO 10)	142
- PRO 11 - Actions for the Implementation of Restructuring of the IHO Committees and Other Groups (PRO 11)	142
- PRO 12 - Establishment of a Working Group to revise the IHO Strategic Plan	143
- PRO 13 - Editorial Amendments to the Host Agreement	145
- PRO 14 - Amendments to Technical Resolution T1.1	145
Consideration of Proposals (Agenda item 3 submitted by the IHO Member States)	147
- PRO 16 - Amendment to Article 6 of the General Regulations and to Rule 5 of the Rules of Procedure for IHO Conferences regarding Observers, so as to comply with EIHC 3, Decision No. 5	147
FOURTH PLENARY SESSION	
Consideration of Proposals (Agenda item 3) (continued)	148
- PRO 12 - Establishment of a Working Group to revise the IHO Strategic Plan (continued)	148
- PRO 17 - Cancelling a Conference decision	149
- PRO 18 - Provision of Regional Staff Officers for Capacity Building effort	150
- PRO 19 - Establishment of a Working Group to study and propose a new edition of the IHB Staff Regulations	152
- PRO 20 - Establishment of a Working Group on Hydrography and Cartography of Inland Waters	154
- PRO 21 - A Resolution on ENC Coverage in relation to ECDIS Carriage Requirements	157

FIFTH PLENARY SESSION		
Consideration of Proposals (Agenda item 3) (continued)		160
- PRO 12 - Establishment of a Working Group to revise the IHO Strategic Plan (Agenda item 3) (continued)		160
- PRO 19 - Establishment of a Working Group to study and propose a new edition of the IHB Staff Regulations (Agenda item 3) (continued)		160
- PRO 20 - Establishment of a Working Group on Hydrography and Cartography of Inland Waters (Agenda item 3) (continued)		161
Consideration of Reports (Agenda item 4)		162
Programme 3 - Report of the Worldwide Electronic Navigational Chart Database (WEND) Committee (Agenda item 4 c)		162
Consideration of Proposals (Agenda item 3) (continued)		163
- PRO 23 - A Resolution on Electronic Navigational Chart Coverage, Availability, Consistency and Quality (Agenda item 3) (continued)		163
- PRO 21 - A Resolution on ENC Coverage in relation to ECDIS Carriage Requirements (Agenda item 3) (continued)		166
- PRO 22 - Establishment of a Working Group on Marine Spatial Data Infrastructure Development (Agenda item 3)		166
- PRO 24 - Resolution inviting contracting Parties to consider the entry into force of the Protocol of Amendments to the Convention as a matter of priority (Agenda item 3)		168
Consideration of the Reports on Work Programme 2002–2007 (Agenda item 4)		169
Programme 1 - Cooperation between Member States and with International Organizations (Agenda item 4 a)		169
SIXTH PLENARY SESSION		
Consideration of the Reports on the Work Programme 2002–2007 (Agenda item 4) (continued)		171
Programme 1 - Cooperation between Member States and with International Organizations (continued)		171
Programme 2 - Capacity building and Technical Cooperation		177
Programme 3 - Techniques and Standards Support		179

SEVENTH PLENARY SESSION	
Consideration of the Reports on the Work Programme 2002–2007 (Agenda item 4) (continued)	181
Programme 3 - Techniques and Standards support (cont.)	181
Programme 4 - Information Management and Public Relations	188
Programme 5 - General Organization Development	189
Resolution expressing gratitude to the Host Country	191
Approval of the proposed IHO Work Programme 2008-2012	191
EIGHTH PLENARY SESSION	
Finance Committee Report (Agenda item 6)	199
Finance Report of IHO 2002-2006	199
IHO five-year budget 2008-2012	200
IHO budget for 2008	201
Report of the Finance Committee Working Group on the salary scheme of the Secretary General and the Directors under the new structure of IHO	202
Reappointment of the External Auditor	202
Report of the Eligibility Committee	202
Other business	202
NINTH PLENARY SESSION	
Election of Directors (Agenda item 8)	203
Closing Ceremony (Agenda item 10)	205
Date of the next Conference	205
Seating order at the next Conference	205
Presentation of prize for IHO Chart Exhibition	205
Statements by outgoing and incoming Directors	205
Closing remarks by the President of the Conference	206

SUMMARY RECORDS**CONF.17/P/SR.1****FIRST PLENARY SESSION****7 May 2007****0900-1045****Rapporteur : Mrs. Liz DUNN (United Kingdom)**CONTENTS

- Confirmation of the election of the President and election of the Vice-President of the Conference
- Election of the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Finance Committee
- Establishment of the Eligibility Committee
- Appointment of Rapporteurs
- Appointment of Scrutineers
- Adoption of the Agenda
- Submission of new proposals
- Approval of the Table of Tonnages
- Opening Ceremony

CONFIRMATION OF THE ELECTION OF THE PRESIDENT AND ELECTION OF THE VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE CONFERENCE

The PRESIDENT OF THE DIRECTING COMMITTEE announced that Dr. Wyn Williams (United Kingdom) had been elected President of the Conference, in accordance with Rule 17 of the Rules of Procedure.

The election of Dr. Williams (United Kingdom) as President was confirmed by acclamation.

Professor Ehlers (Germany), seconded by Captain Steve Barnum (United States), Mr. Svend Eskildsen (Denmark) and Captain Abri Kampfner (South Africa), nominated Dr. Savithri Narayanan (Canada) for election as Vice-President of the Conference.

Dr. Savithri Narayanan (Canada) was elected Vice-President by acclamation.

Dr. Williams took the Chair.

The PRESIDENT expressed his gratitude for the honour the Conference had bestowed on Dr. Narayanan and himself by electing them Vice-President and President respectively of the Conference. The United Kingdom, which had a long and illustrious history as a maritime nation and

had been a strong supporter of IHO since its formation some 86 years earlier, held firmly to international cooperation on all aspects of safety at sea and to the protection of marine and coastal environments, and was fully committed to the future work and prosperity of IHO. It was beyond question that the Organization must develop and change if it was to be successful in the future. The path forward had been set at the 3rd Extraordinary International Hydrographic Conference, following the excellent work of the Strategic Planning Working Group over three years. It was for the present Conference to dot the 'i's and cross the 't's of the decisions taken in 2005, to enshrine the future regulations and rules of procedure of the Organization and to define a plan of implementation: that left only the job of obtaining formal approval of the changes at national level, and he urged all delegations to find ways of expediting that process. He thanked the chairmen and members of the committees and commissions for their invaluable work on behalf of international cooperation in hydrography. He commended the present Directing Committee for their excellent work on behalf of Member States and in securing the safety of life at sea and the protection of the marine environment. He welcomed the new Hydrographers and wished every one a good week.

ELECTION OF THE CHAIRMAN AND VICE-CHAIRMAN OF THE FINANCE COMMITTEE

Mr. Bissuel (Monaco) nominated Mr. Jean-Noël Veran (Monaco) and IGA Gilles Bessero (France) nominated Mr. Richard Luigi (France) as Chairman and Vice-Chairman respectively of the Finance Committee.

Mr. Jean-Noël Veran (Monaco) and Mr. Richard Luigi (France) were elected Chairman and Vice-Chairman respectively of the Finance Committee by acclamation.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE ELIGIBILITY COMMITTEE

The PRESIDENT announced that Argentina, India, Indonesia, The Islamic Republic of Iran, Italy, New Zealand and Tunisia had agreed to provide one representative each for the Eligibility Committee. The representative of India would serve as Chairman and the representative of Argentina as Vice-Chairman.

It was so agreed.

APPOINTMENT OF RAPPORTEURS

Mrs. Liz Dunn (United Kingdom), Captain Mike Barritt (United Kingdom), Mr. Keith Alexander (United States of America), Mr. Steven Debrecht (United States of America) and Mr. Sean Hinds (Canada) were appointed Rapporteurs for the plenary sessions.

APPOINTMENT OF SCRUTINEERS

A team of scrutineers, consisting of one representative each from Brazil, China, France, Oman and the United States of America, was established to scrutinize the votes for the election of the new Directing Committee.

SUBMISSION OF NEW PROPOSALS

The PRESIDENT announced that four new proposals had reached the Bureau after the expiry of the deadline five months previously. In accordance with Article 9 (b) of the General Regulations of IHO, submission of those proposals was subject to approval by the Conference. As time was running short, he suggested that discussion of the item should be deferred to the second plenary session.

It was so agreed.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA (CONF.17/G/01 Rev.5)

The Agenda was adopted.

APPROVAL OF THE TABLE OF TONNAGES, SHARES AND VOTES (CONF.17/G/03 Rev.2)

Rear Admiral MONCRIEFF (United Kingdom) said that the reported tonnage figure for the United Kingdom should be amended to read 31,189,390, instead of 41,189,390 as stated in the table. The amendment had no impact on the United Kingdom's shares or votes or on its financial share, but it did have the effect of moving the United Kingdom from second to fourth position in terms of its potential representation on the Council.

Rear Admiral ANDREASEN (United States of America) pointed out that following the net change in the number of shares resulting from tonnage changes reported by Cuba and the Republic of Korea, and as a possible consequence of the amendment by the United Kingdom, two lines should be changed in the projected budgets for 2008-2012 and 2008: the projected number of shares should be 673, and the share value should drop by about 18 euros.

The PRESIDENT OF THE DIRECTING COMMITTEE confirmed that the Bureau had received, one week earlier, changes in the tonnage reported by the Republic of Korea and Cuba, resulting in a net gain of three shares. That would be reflected in the Report of the Finance Committee, but it did not change the next five-year budget significantly, as it added only about 10,000 euros per year to the income of the Organization.

The PRESIDENT invited the Conference to approve the Table of Tonnages, Shares and Votes as amended, taking note of the comment by the United States.

It was so agreed.

OPENING CEREMONY

His Serene Highness PRINCE ALBERT II of Monaco was escorted into the Hall and took his seat on the podium.

The PRESIDENT OF THE DIRECTING COMMITTEE delivered an address of welcome, which is reproduced in these Conference Proceedings.

The CONFERENCE PRESIDENT delivered his Opening Address, which is reproduced in these Conference Proceedings.

HIS SERENE HIGHNESS PRINCE ALBERT II delivered an address declaring open the Seventeenth International Hydrographic Conference, which is also reproduced in these Conference Proceedings.

Presentation of the Prince Albert Ist Medal

His Serene Highness PRINCE ALBERT II of Monaco presented the Prince Albert Ist medal to Vice Admiral MARATOS for his article published in the International Hydrographic Review.

Presentation of prizes for Chart Exhibition

Rear Admiral BARBOR said Hydrographic Offices had participated in the IHO Chart Exhibition at the 2005 International Cartographic Conference in La Coruña, Spain of the International Cartographic Association and the prize for the best display had been awarded to Australia. The prize was presented to Captain Rod NAIRN.

Flag Presentation Ceremony

THE PRESIDENT OF THE DIRECTING COMMITTEE invited the representatives of Mauritius, Myanmar, Romania and Saudi Arabia to present their countries' flags, as was the tradition.

Admiral ABRAMOV (Russian Federation) noted that the International Hydrographic Organization rightly enjoyed respect and prestige within the international maritime community for its work to improve the safety of navigation. The Russian Hydrographic Service, equipped with a significant fleet of survey vessels and modern technologies, was playing its part in making a world collection of nautical charts to contribute to the range of modern aids to navigation, and was working to introduce electronic navigation charts.

The Russian Federation supported the new structure of the International Hydrographic Organization, which would allow it to be more timely and efficient in promoting the safety of navigation. The work of the current Conference would serve to finalize the new structure, ready for its entry into force in 2009.

He presented IHO with a Russian naval telescope, a symbolic means of looking far into the future work of the Organization.

His Serene Highness was escorted from the Hall.

CONF.17/P/SR.2

SECOND PLENARY SESSION

7 May 2007

1405 - 1745

Rapporteur : Captain Mike BARRITT (United Kingdom)

CONTENTS

- Consideration of Proposals (Agenda item 3)
- Additional Proposals
- PRO 1- Noting of the Report on the Strategic Planning Working Group
- PRO 2 - Approval of an Implementation Plan for the new IHO structure
- PRO 3 - Approval of the Amended IHO General Regulations
- PRO 4 - Approval of the Amended IHO Financial Regulations
- PRO 5 - Approval of the Rules of Procedure of the IHO Assembly
- PRO 6 - Approval of the Rules of Procedure of the IHO Council
- PRO 7 - Approval of the Rules of Procedure of the IHO Finance Committee
- PRO 2 - Approval of an Implementation Plan for the new IHO structure (resumed)

- PRO 3 - Approval of the Amended IHO General Regulations (resumed)
 - Additional Proposals (resumed)
-

CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSALS (CONF.17/G/02) (Agenda item 3)

ADDITIONAL PROPOSALS (CONF.17/G/02/Add.1 to Add.3)

The PRESIDENT drew attention to four proposals that had been submitted after the scheduled deadline, contained in documents CONF.17/G/02/Add.1, CONF.17/G/02/Add.2 and CONF.17/G/02/Add.3. In the absence of any objection to those proposals being debated under Agenda item 3, he took it that the Conference agreed to consider them as Proposals 20, 21, 22 and 23.

It was so agreed.

Professor EHLERS (Germany), noting the slow progress towards entry into force of the protocol of amendments to the IHO Convention, proposed that the Conference should adopt a resolution encouraging Parties to expedite approval of the amendments. He would submit a proposal along these lines.

The PRESIDENT said he took it that the Conference would wish to consider such a proposal, which would be included on the Agenda as Proposal 24.

It was so agreed.

In response to a query by IGA BESSERO (France), the PRESIDENT stated that the Conference would proceed to discuss those proposals which related to matters which would be covered by later Agenda items.

PRO 1 - NOTING THE REPORT OF THE STRATEGIC PLANNING WORKING GROUP (CONF.17/DOC.1)

Commander KLEPSVIK (Norway), Chairman of the Strategic Planning Working Group (SPWG), introducing the proposal, drew attention to the Terms of Reference for the SPWG, as amended by the 3rd Extraordinary International Hydrographic Conference (EIHC), which were contained in Annex C of document CONF.17/DOC.1. Taking into account the debate and decisions of the 3rd EIHC and following a number of meetings, with input from legal experts, the SPWG had produced the report now before the Conference, including the fourteen proposals to the XVIIth IHC contained in paragraph 9. He drew attention in particular to the single criterion of tonnage to be used for defining hydrographic interest for Council membership, as decided by the 3rd EIHC, noting that the subject would be revisited no later than the second Assembly, in the light of experience gained during the interim.

The report was noted.

PRO 2 - APPROVAL OF AN IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FOR THE NEW IHO STRUCTURE (CONF.17/DOC.1)

Commander KLEPSVIK (Norway), Chairman of the SPWG, introducing the proposal contained in paragraph 5 of the report, said the SPWG had dealt with three principal issues: the transition from an International Hydrographic Conference to an Assembly; the establishment of the Council; and the transition from IHB to the Secretariat. The SPWG proposals concerning the latter question, which had implications for the length of service of Directors, had been the subject of Circular Letter 37/2006, and had been accepted by the Member States. He outlined the implementation plan concerning the transition from the Conference to the Assembly and the establishment of the Council, contained in paragraphs 1 and 2 of PRO 2.

IGA BESSERO (France) requested clarification of the transitional provisions concerning the maximum term of office of Directors under the new structure.

Commander KLEPSVIK (Norway), Chairman of the SPWG, explained that no particular rule had been laid down for serving Directors whose five-year term of office was extended to nine years, but that it was theoretically possible for a Director currently serving a five-year term to serve for an additional nine years.

Professor EHLERS (Germany) said that, from a legal viewpoint, some additional wording was needed to clarify the transition from IHB to the Secretariat. It could, for instance, be stipulated that IHB would perform the tasks of the Secretariat until the first Assembly or, should that be considered too soon, for a further period of three months after the first Assembly.

Commander KLEPSVIK (Norway), Chairman of the SPWG, said he did not object to the inclusion of language to that effect. The SPWG had not considered it necessary to regulate the matter formally, assuming that the transition date would be three months from the date of ratification.

Rear Admiral ANDREASEN (United States of America) endorsed the proposal by the representative of Germany.

The PRESIDENT suggested that a group of legal experts, comprising the delegations of Canada, Germany, the United Kingdom and the United States of America, should draft wording along those lines. The proposal would be left in abeyance pending submission of the revised text.

It was so agreed.

PRO 3 – APPROVAL OF THE AMENDED IHO GENERAL REGULATIONS (CONF.17/DOC.2)

Commander KLEPSVIK (Norway), Chairman of the SPWG, introducing the proposal, said that the revised version of the General Regulations now before the Conference had been refined in the course of several meetings, to reflect discussions held at the 3rd EIHC and the advice of legal experts. Articles 6, 7, 8 and 17 had been discussed in particular detail.

The PRESIDENT noted that formal amendments had been submitted by Australia, France and the United States of America.

Captain NAIRN (Australia) supported the proposal. However, his delegation wished to propose a new article to follow Article 9, to cover the case of the body now known as the Hydrographic Committee on Antarctica (HCA). The HCA could not operate under Article 9 of the revised General Regulations because of its restricted membership requirements, which did not apply to the other Regional Hydrographic Commissions (RHCs). For that reason, the HCA should be considered a

special hydrographic commission. His proposal might serve in future to cover other special hydrographic commissions.

Dr. ESTIRI (Islamic Republic of Iran) supported that proposal. Additional hydrographic commissions, for example for the Caspian Sea, would be facilitated by such special status.

Professor EHLERS (Germany) pointed out that one of the purposes of revising the General Regulations had been to halt the proliferation of different bodies and establish a consistent system for establishing them. There should be two systematic approaches: the RHC approach, under Article 9, and the IHO subordinate body approach, under Article 6. The particular case of the HCA could perhaps be dealt with by reaching agreement on different terms of reference (TORs) for that Commission.

IGA BESSERO (France) agreed. The HCA could be covered by draft Article 6(b). In his view, all subsidiary organs and bodies should be governed by Articles 6 and 9. As for the HCA, any Member State of the IHO could be an observer of its proceedings.

Commander KLEPSVIK (Norway), Chairman of the SPWG, said the observation by the representative of Germany reflected the consensus reached in the SPWG, namely that new bodies should be established in accordance with Articles 6, 8 or 9, and that it would be better to adapt the ToRs of the HCA to match the new General Regulations.

Captain NAIRN (Australia) asked whether, if the HCA became an RHC, it would be represented on the Council.

Rear Admiral ANDREASEN (United States of America) supported the proposal by the delegation of Australia, on the understanding that Antarctica was a special case.

Commander KLEPSVIK (Norway), Chairman of the SPWG, said the SPWG had decided that, because of its special structure, the HCA should not have a seat on the Council, but could be aligned with the new General Regulations in accordance with Article 6. That would not have the effect of turning it into an RHC.

Captain IBARRA (Chile) supported the Australian proposal. He agreed with the representative of the United States that the HCA was indeed a specific case because of its special status.

Mr. HOOTON (United Kingdom) agreed that the HCA had a status different from that of the RHCs. However, he did not accept the argument that the HCA could not operate under Article 9 because its membership was not open to all IHO Member States. There were already two RHCs operating under Article 9 whose membership was not open to all Member States. The RHCs were not constituent parts of IHO, whereas the HCA had effectively been created by it.

Professor EHLERS (Germany) said that he was aware of the specific character of the HCA, but it could be fully accommodated under Article 6(c), if its ToRs were adjusted.

Rear Admiral ANDREASEN (United States of America) queried whether, under the new arrangement, RHCs would become official organs of IHO instead of being established by Member States themselves.

Commander KLEPSVIK (Norway), Chairman of the SPWG, said the SPWG had discussed at length how RHCs stood in relation to the formal structures of IHO, a matter not covered by the Convention or its amendments. The SPWG had concluded that RHCs entitled to a seat on the Council (Art. 9 (b)) should be recognized by the Assembly, without formally becoming organs of IHO.

Captain NAIRN (Australia), reiterating his position which he stated as Vice Chairman of HCA, pointed out that there were no coastal states in Antarctica, which was within the remit of several international organizations. The HCA acted as a link between them and IHO. Article 6 (b) of the revised General Regulations stated that membership of Committees shall be open to all Member States, whereas HCA membership was confined to States signatories to the Antarctic Treaty.

The PRESIDENT invited the Conference to indicate support for the proposed amendment.

The proposal was rejected.

Captain NAIRN (Australia) said he would discuss with the Chairmen of the HCA and of the SPWG how the statutes of the HCA could be amended to bring them into line with the provisions of Article 6.

IGA BESSERO (France), introducing the amendment proposed by France to Article 17 (b), said that as it stood, the text did not make clear how a Member State would be accounted for in calculating the number of seats allocated to each RHC.

Professor EHLERS (Germany) said Article 17 was already clear enough. It stated that two-thirds of Council seats would be held by Member States selected by RHCs, the remaining third to be selected on the basis of 'hydrographic interest'. All Member States would be therefore taken into account, and those that were members of more than one RHC would not be counted more than once.

Commander KLEPSVIK (Norway), Chairman of the SPWG, explained that Article 17 was based on the assumption that no Member State could choose to be left out of consideration in the selection of Council members. It would be the duty of the Secretary-General to ensure that the membership of RHCs equalled that of IHO.

Dr. NISHIDA (Japan) and Captain WARD (Australia) supported the proposal by France. The revision proposed by that delegation would obviate any uncertainty or misinterpretation of Article 17.

Mr. HOOTON (United Kingdom), supported by IGA BESSERO (France) said Article 17 (b) (v) should be redrafted to reflect the intention of the SPWG that every Member State should only be counted once.

Professor EHLERS (Germany) said the Conference appeared to be in agreement on the general thrust of Article 17. Legal experts could be asked to produce a completely unambiguous text.

The PRESIDENT suggested that the delegation of France withdraw its proposal and that the Conference revert to Article 17 when the legal experts had drafted a fresh text.

It was so agreed.

The PRESIDENT asked whether the delegation of the United States wished the legal experts to consider its proposed amendment to Article 7 at the same time.

Rear Admiral ANDREASEN (United States of America), introducing his delegation's proposed revision of Article 7, said that, as it stood, that Article did not ensure legal experts from all Member States would have an opportunity to provide advice if they wished to do so. The amendment sought to clarify the situation.

Professor EHLERS (Germany) proposed the deletion of Article 7. Article 6 already made sufficient provision for the establishment of working groups. Moreover, the effect of the proposed amendment would be to make it mandatory to set up groups of legal experts. The Assembly should not be subject to prescriptive regulations of that sort.

Rear Admiral CAGNETTI (Italy) and Admiral ABRAMOV (Russian Federation) agreed.

Mr. SAHEB-ETTABA (Canada) supported the proposed amendment. If Article 7 were deleted, the principle that IHO had to seek legal advice from the Member States rather than from private legal experts would be undermined.

Rear Admiral ANDREASEN (United States of America) said the proposed amendment did not seek to compel the establishment of groups of legal experts, but merely to ensure that the legal advice obtained was not restricted to only one part of the Organization.

The PRESIDENT invited the Conference to indicate support for the proposal to delete Article 7.

The proposal to delete Article 7 was adopted.

Rear Admiral ANDREASEN (United States of America), introducing his delegation's proposed amendment to Article 9, said the intention was to make it simpler for Member States to join an RHC.

Mr. HOOTON (United Kingdom), supported by IGA BESSERO (France), said that such an amendment could not be effective, because the RHCs had their own statutes, and the IHO had no authority over them.

Professor EHLERS (Germany) agreed. He queried the term 'in good standing'. Since rights of Member States were laid down in the Convention, adding language in need of interpretation would cause confusion.

Rear Admiral ANDREASEN (United States of America) withdrew his proposal. In his view, however, it was odd that seats on the Council could be gained through unofficial bodies.

The PRESIDENT invited the United States delegation to introduce its proposed amendment to Article 21.

Rear Admiral ANDREASEN (United States of America) said the purpose of the amendment was to ensure that a nomination was signed by a qualified person.

Professor EHLERS (Germany), supported by Mr. BISSUEL (Monaco), objected to the amendment as a matter of legal principle. States could not be told how they should be represented in the Organization.

Rear Admiral ANDREASEN (United States of America) withdrew the proposed amendment.

Dr. NISHIDA (Japan) withdrew a proposed minor amendment to Article 11.

PRO 4 – APPROVAL OF THE AMENDED IHO FINANCIAL REGULATIONS (CONF.17/DOC.3)

Commander KLEPSVIK (Norway), Chairman of the SPWG, said the new version contained all the amendments made to the Financial Regulations in the past two years.

The PRESIDENT OF THE DIRECTING COMMITTEE recalled that, during the most recent meeting of the Finance Committee, the Auditor noted the wording of Article 19 (b) and considered it to be overly strong. It was proposed to delete paragraph (b) and substitute the words '... subject to annual confirmation by the Council' for 'subject to Article 19(b) below' in paragraph (a).

Professor EHLERS (Germany) pointed out that if the Council did not confirm the Auditor, it must have the power to appoint a new one. There was no such provision in the proposed amendment.

The PRESIDENT, speaking on behalf of the PRESIDENT OF THE DIRECTING COMMITTEE, withdrew the proposed amendment.

The proposal was adopted.

PRO 5 - APPROVAL OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE IHO ASSEMBLY (CONF.17/DOC.4)

The PRESIDENT drew attention to the proposal submitted by the SPWG set out in document CONF.17/DOC.4. The implementation of the Rules would be subject to entry into force of the Protocol of Amendments to the IHO Convention.

Professor EHLERS (Germany) suggested deleting the subheading to Rule 8, which seemed to be irrelevant. Rule 9 should also be deleted because, as an intergovernmental organization, IHO should avoid granting rights of attendance for individuals. The Assembly could in any case agree to invite guests or experts. The Rules of Procedure of the IHO Council (PRO 6) and the Rules of Procedure of the IHO Finance Committee (PRO 7) should be amended accordingly.

Commander KLEPSVIK (Norway), Chairman of the SPWG, said that the proposed Rules 8 and 9 were intended to replace Rule 10 of the current Rules of Procedure, requiring meetings of the Conference, its Committees and other subsidiary bodies to be held in public unless the body concerned decided otherwise. The SPWG felt it was necessary to clarify the question of public attendance.

Mr. KWOK-CHU NG (China) supported the proposal by the representative of Germany.

Dr. ESTIRI (Islamic Republic of Iran) also supported that proposal, suggesting that the matter be referred back to the SPWG for further deliberation.

Mr. BISSUEL (Monaco) said the matter of public attendance should be given careful consideration. He suggested that practice might be based on that of the IMO.

Professor EHLERS (Germany) said that if IHO meetings were made open to public attendance, the intention of the proposed Rules 8 and 9 would be exceeded; any interested party could attend, including journalists. Excluding particular groups might expose the Organization to public pressure, as had happened elsewhere; yet a general right of attendance would give rise to that very difficulty, and might change the nature of IHO meetings.

Commander KLEPSVIK (Norway), Chairman of the SPWG, said that, in the view of the SPWG, the Assembly ought to have the authority to control public attendance at its meetings. He agreed, however, that the subheading "Public attendance" did not apply to the proposed Rule 8. He suggested placing it above the proposed Rule 9.

Rear Admiral RAO (India) endorsed the remarks made by the representative of Germany. The Assembly was a technical body attended by technical experts. Opening its meetings to public attendance might well change their character. The Conference should be aware of the full implications of any amendments to the Rules of Procedure, and should avoid complicating the proposed structural changes.

Captain WARD (Australia) also agreed with the representative of Germany. The subheading "Public attendance" and the proposed Rule 9 should both be deleted.

The PRESIDENT OF THE DIRECTING COMMITTEE said that the deletion of Rule 9 would leave no scope to cover former Directors or others, such as members of a school or university group

wanting to see how an organization such as IHO conducted its business. The list of observers in Article 4 of the General Regulations does not cover these cases.

Captain KAMPFER (South Africa) observed that since Rule 5 permitted attendance by observers, the deletion of Rule 9 would not prevent individuals from attending.

The PRESIDENT pointed out that Rule 5 provided for attendance only by observers from Member States or from intergovernmental or nongovernmental organizations. It did not extend to individuals.

Professor EHLERS (Germany) said that deleting Rule 9 would not debar visitors from meetings of the IHO governing bodies, which would make such decisions on a case-by-case basis. The IHO should avoid adopting rules that might set a precedent.

The PRESIDENT said he would take it that the Conference wished to approve the proposal by the delegation of Germany to delete the subheading to Rule 8 and the whole of Rule 9. Subsequent Rules would be renumbered accordingly.

The amendments were adopted.

Dr. NISHIDA (Japan) proposed replacing the words “shall receive copies of all documents” in the last sentence of Rule 5 by “may receive documents not classified as confidential”.

Commander KLEPSVIK (Norway), Chairman of the SPWG, said that since the IHO did not have confidential documents, the amendment was unnecessary.

Dr. NISHIDA (Japan) withdrew the amendment.

PRO 5, as amended, was adopted.

PRO 6 – APPROVAL OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE IHO COUNCIL (CONF.17/DOC.5)

Commander KLEPSVIK (Norway), Chairman of the SPWG, introduced the proposed new text of the Rules of Procedure for the IHO Council, set out in document CONF.17/DOC.5. Implementation of the Rules would be subject to the entry into force of the Protocol of Amendments to the IHO Convention.

Professor EHLERS (Germany) said that the Rules of Procedure of the Council should be amended by deleting the subheading “Public attendance” and the whole of Rule 7, subsequent Rules being renumbered accordingly.

The amendments were adopted.

In reply to a query by IGA BESSERO (France), the PRESIDENT confirmed that the French text would in every instance be aligned with the English text.

PRO 6, as amended, was adopted.

PRO 7 - APPROVAL OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE IHO FINANCE COMMITTEE (CONF.17/DOC.6)

The PRESIDENT said that the proposal submitted by the SPWG requested approval of the text of the Rules of Procedure for the IHO Finance Committee, set out in document CONF.17/DOC.6. Implementation of the Rules would be subject to the entry into force of the Protocol of Amendments to the IHO Convention. In line with the amendments proposed to PRO 5 and PRO 6, the

representative of Germany wished to propose that PRO 7 should be amended by deleting the subheading “Public attendance” and the whole of Rule 6, subsequent rules being renumbered accordingly.

The amendments were adopted.

PRO 7, as amended, was adopted.

PRO 2 - APPROVAL OF AN IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FOR THE NEW IHO STRUCTURE (resumed)

The PRESIDENT said that the group of legal experts requested to consider the wording of proposed new paragraph 3 had proposed that it should read:

“3. *Transition of the International Hydrographic Bureau (IHB) to the Secretariat*

During the period between the DoR and [date of the 1st Assembly/a date three months after the 1st Assembly/other date to be decided] the IHB shall have the authority required and shall adopt such measures as may be necessary for transition of the IHB to the Secretariat.”

Professor EHLERS (Germany) supported the proposal in principle, but suggested that the term “DoR” (Date of Ratification) should be replaced by “date of entry into force”, that being the term used in the Convention. Of the options shown in square brackets, he would prefer “a date three months after the 1st Assembly”.

Commander KLEPSVIK (Norway), Chairman of the SPWG, said that a definition of the term “DoR” appeared following paragraph 1. If the Conference adopted the amendment proposed by the representative of Germany, the entire proposal would have to be reconsidered.

Captain WARD (Australia) and Dr. ESTIRI (Islamic Republic of Iran) supported the proposed amendment.

Commander KLEPSVIK (Norway), Chairman of the SPWG, said that the date of entry into force of the amended Convention was three months after the date of receipt of the final ratification. The impact of any revised text should be considered carefully.

Mr. SAHEB-ETTABA (Canada) said that since the transition from IHB to Secretariat would only be effective at the date of entry into force of the amended Convention, that date and not the date of ratification should be included in the implementation plan.

The PRESIDENT suggested that further consideration of PRO 2 should be deferred, pending informal consultations to clarify the text.

It was so agreed.

**PRO 3 - APPROVAL OF THE AMENDED IHO REGULATIONS (CONF.17/DOC.2)
(resumed)**

The PRESIDENT said that the Group of Legal Experts requested to consider Article 17 b) v) had suggested the following text:

“(v) for the purpose of deciding how many Council seats are allocated to each RHC the Secretary-General shall calculate the number of full members of each RHC. In making that calculation the Secretary-General shall ensure that every Member State is counted as a full Member of one, but not more than one, RHC.”

IGA BESSERO (France) proposed deleting “shall calculate the number of full members of each RHC. In making that calculation the Secretary-General”. The number of full members of each RHC was already known and did not have to be calculated.

Rear Admiral ANDREASEN (United States of America) said he could accept the revised text as just amended.

The amendment was adopted.

PRO 3, as amended, was adopted.

ADDITIONAL PROPOSALS (CONF.17/G/02 Add. 4) (resumed)

The PRESIDENT drew attention to the text of PRO 24, submitted by the delegations of Denmark, Germany, Norway and Sweden, set out in document CONF.17/G02 Add. 4. In the absence of any objection, he would take it that the Conference was willing to consider the proposal.

It was so decided.

THIRD PLENARY SESSION

8 May 2007

CONF.17/P/SR.3

0900-1300

Rapporteur : Captain Mike BARRITT (United Kingdom)

CONTENTS

Consideration of Proposals (Agenda item 3) (continued)

- PRO 2 - Approval of an Implementation Plan for the new IHO Structure (continued)
- PRO 8 - Approval of the Re-structuring of IHO Committees and Other Groups (PRO 8)
- PRO 9 - Advanced entry into force of the Re-structuring of IHO Committees and Other Groups

- PRO 10 - Chairmanship of HSCC and IRCC Committees (PRO 10)
- PRO 11 - Actions for the Implementation of Restructuring of the IHO Committees and Other Groups (PRO 11)
- PRO 12 - Establishment of a Working Group to revise the IHO Strategic Plan
- PRO 13 - Amendments to the Host Agreement
- PRO 14 - Amendments to Technical Resolution T1.1

Consideration of Proposals (Agenda item 3 submitted by the IHO Member States)

- PRO 16 - Amendment to Article 6 of the General Regulations and to Rule 5 of the Rules of Procedure for IHO Conferences regarding Observers, so as to comply with EIHC 3, Decision No. 5

The PRESIDENT thanked the exhibitors on behalf of the Conference for the reception offered to Conference participants the previous evening.

CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSALS (continued)

PRO 2 – APPROVAL OF AN IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FOR THE NEW IHO STRUCTURE (CONF.17/DOC.1) (continued)

The PRESIDENT drew attention to an amendment by Germany to Proposal 2, namely: “During the period between the DoA and a date three months after the first Assembly, the IHB shall have the authority required and shall adopt such measures as may be necessary for transition of the IHB to the Secretariat”.

The abbreviation “DoA” stood for “Date of Approval”. It would replace the proposed “Date of Ratification”, and would be explained in the definitions part of Proposal 2.

Mr. HOOTON (United Kingdom) suggested including the explanation in the early part of the text.

Mr. SAHEB-ETTABA (Canada) queried the meaning of “Date of Approval”.

Commander KLEPSVIK (Norway), Chairman of the SPWG, explained that the German delegation had drawn attention to the fact that “ratification” was not a term used in the Protocol approved by the 3rd Extraordinary International Hydrographic Conference. Article 20 of the Protocol stated: “In accordance with Article XXI (c) of the IHO Convention, the amendments here above mentioned from Article 1 to Article 20 shall enter into force for all Contracting Parties three months after notifications of approval by two-thirds of the Member States have been received by the Depositary”. The term “approval” should therefore appear in Proposal 2, in the interest of consistency. The purpose of the term “DoA” was only to set a target date; it was not supposed to have any particular legal binding force.

IGA BESSERO (France) suggested amending “the IHB shall have ...”, to “the Directing Committee shall have”.

Professor EHLERS (Germany), supported by Mr. SAHEB-ETTABA (Canada), responded that under the present Convention it was the IHB, presided over by the Directing Committee, that ran IHO.

Accordingly the organ that would cease to exist and would be transformed into the Secretariat was not the Directing Committee but the IHB.

IGA BESSERO (France) said his delegation's proposal was based upon Article 23 (a) of the current General Regulations.

Professor EHLERS (Germany) said that Article 23 a) of the General Regulations stated that the Directing Committee was supposed to administer the IHB. From a legal point of view, this proposal must deal with the organ, not with those responsible for the organ.

Captain SOBOLEV (Russian Federation) agreed with France that it was important to make clear that the Directing Committee was responsible for the organ.

Commander KLEPSVIK (Norway) Chairman of the SPWG, stated that Articles 4 and 10 of the current Convention covered this point.

The PRESIDENT said that in view of the considerable degree of support expressed for retaining the words "the IHB", he took it that the Conference accepted the proposed amendment.

It was so agreed.

Summing up, the PRESIDENT said that Proposal 2 would be amended by inserting the new wording replacing the term "ratification" by "approval", and relocating the definition to the beginning of the Proposal.

PRO 2, as amended, was adopted.

PRO 8 - APPROVAL OF THE RE-STRUCTURING OF IHO COMMITTEES AND OTHER GROUPS (CONF.17/DOC.1)

Commander KLEPSVIK (Norway), Chairman of the SPWG, recalled that in Decision No. 3 of the 3rd Extraordinary International Hydrographic Conference, Member States had agreed in principle that IHO subsidiary organs would be subordinate to two main committees. However, that decision had been conditional upon a more detailed study, the results of which were shown in paragraph 5.1 and Annexes G and H of the report of the SPWG. To prepare for the restructuring, the Chairmen of the Capacity Building Committee and of the Committee on Hydrographic Requirements for Information Systems (CHRIS) had been asked to prepare a restructuring plan for all the subordinate bodies of the various committees, together with terms of reference for each of them. That plan had subsequently been presented to the SPWG.

Captain NAIRN (Australia) said that a proposed amendment put forward by his delegation had been dependent upon Australia's proposal to amend Proposal 3. Since the statutes and the form of the Hydrographic Committee on Antarctica would have to be completely reviewed under Article 6, he withdrew the amendment to Proposal 8.

Rear Admiral ANDREASEN (United States of America) said his delegation was having difficulty in assigning almost 40 working groups and commissions to only two categories. It was suggesting the addition of the words "chair groups" to the titles of the HSSC and IRCC, thus enabling present Commissions, Committees and Sub-groups to retain their current titles. Some of them felt that degradation in status would impact on attendance. Change would also affect references in IMO publications. They were aware of some opposition to that idea, but how were their concerns to be addressed?

Commander KLEPSVIK (Norway), Chairman of the SPWG, said that the implications of the restructuring had been very thoroughly discussed at all the SPWG meetings. It had been recognized

that making significant changes through a restructuring process might have negative effects, but it was more important to carry them through. When discussing the Commission on Promulgation of Radio Navigational Warnings (CPRNW), for example, the SPWG had concluded that the changes themselves were more important than giving special consideration to that particular body. The structure finally produced by the SPWG was intended to make the whole Organization more efficient.

Captain NAIRN (Australia), supported by Rear Admiral ANDREASEN (United States of America), said that the restructuring proposed by the SPWG did not necessarily require changing the names of the subsidiary bodies. They would continue to be subcommittees, whatever their names. Their status would be reflected in their terms of reference.

Rear Admiral MONCRIEFF (United Kingdom) agreed. The internal reporting procedures of subsidiary bodies and their relative standing were matters for IHO alone. It was important not to sow confusion in the outside world, where their work under their existing names was understood and appreciated.

Captain SOBOLEV (Russian Federation) supported the structure developed by the SPWG. It should not be changed.

Mr. MAGNUSSON (Sweden) pointed out that the Conference had already changed the Convention and the General Regulations. History was very important, but it was now time to restructure the commissions and working groups in line with the SPWG proposal, in order to establish an appropriate structure for the future.

IGA BESSERO (France) agreed. The disadvantages inherent in the name changes were relatively minor.

Dr. NARAYANAN (Canada) pointed out that in the intergovernmental sphere, the concepts of "commission" and "committee" had precise meanings and were in common usage. It did not seem right for IHO to stand alone. Canada was in favour of consistency across intergovernmental organizations. She therefore supported the SPWG proposal, and could not agree with the views expressed by the delegations of Australia and the United Kingdom.

Mr. SPITTAL (New Zealand) said that in the past, the committees seemed to have grown in an unsupervised manner, resulting in some duplication of work. Had it not been the remit of the SPWG to streamline the structure?

The PRESIDENT confirmed that that was the intention. Some of the many subordinate bodies were to be streamlined out of existence.

Dr. NISHIDA (Japan) pointed out that Japan had not withdrawn its proposed amendment, which seemed to have a bearing on the suggestions by the delegations of the United States and Australia. His own delegation's concern was not with names, but with the location within the proposed structure of bodies such as ABLOS or GEBCO.

The PRESIDENT explained that some organs of IHO, such as ABLOS or GEBCO, were joint organizations with other international bodies. The names of those organizations would not change. The intention in Proposal 8 was to ensure that the heads of organizations that were IHO members would be accountable to the HSSC and the IRRC. At present, the heads of bodies such as GEBCO or ABLOS reported directly to the Conference. Their reports were transmitted to the IHB, and issued by the IHB as Circular Letters. They also reported to the appropriate entity in their other parent organization. Under the new structure, their reports would be more frequent, since they would be reporting to main committees meeting every year, rather than to the Conference. The reports would in turn be presented to the Conference by the Chairmen of HSSC and the IRRC, in the same way as reports from other subsidiary bodies.

Dr. NISHIDA (Japan) said that would be acceptable to his delegation.

The PRESIDENT said the Conference appeared to be in agreement on the streamlined structure proposed by the SPWG, and preferred not to dilute it simply in order to retain some existing names.

IGA BESSERO (France) said it would be necessary to standardize the provisions of the Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure of the HSSC and the IRCC, in both the French and English versions, dealing with the transition to the new organizational structure.

The PRESIDENT of the IHB said that if the Conference approved the new structure, the Chairmen of the two Committees and the Directing Committee, in consultation with Member States, would be responsible for standardizing the texts.

Commander KLEPSVIK (Norway), Chairman of the SPWG, recalled that the Bureau had been requested to make editorial changes resulting from the revised IHO Convention. He suggested a similar procedure for the Committee texts.

The PRESIDENT noted the undertaking to the Conference that the texts would be harmonized by the Bureau and the Committee Chairmen.

Mr. KORHONEN (Finland) expressed his support for the proposal as it stood. Coordination with the various sub-committees and working groups would be very important and should be spelled out in greater detail.

The PRESIDENT said he took it that the Conference wished to adopt PRO 8.

It was so decided.

PRO 9 - ADVANCED ENTRY INTO FORCE OF THE RE-STRUCTURING OF IHO COMMITTEES AND OTHER GROUPS (CONF.17/DOC.1 – Annex I)

The PRESIDENT invited the Chairman of the SPWG to introduce the proposal.

Commander KLEPSVIK (Norway), Chairman of the SPWG, said that implementing the new structure in advance of the ratification of the revised IHO Convention did not contravene the present Convention. It was therefore proposed that the new structure should enter into force on 1 January 2009.

The PRESIDENT, drawing attention to the comment by France, said he took it that France was proposing to insert the words “at the latest” after “1 January 2009.”

IGA BESSERO (France) stated that the aim was to introduce a degree of flexibility.

Captain KAMPFER (South Africa) sought clarification that entry into force could happen earlier than 1 January 2009, not later.

The PRESIDENT confirmed that understanding.

Captain WARD (Australia), speaking on behalf of the Australian delegation and as Chairman of CHRIS, supported the amendment. An element of flexibility would enable the various committees and groups to make the transition to the new arrangements at a time convenient to themselves.

Commander LUSIANI (Italy) supported the amendment in principle. However, there was a risk involved in having a new structure in place before the revised IHO Convention was ratified and the Council was in place to provide a focus for reports.

Commander KLEPSVIK (Norway), Chairman of the SPWG, said that the SPWG had concluded, after careful consideration, that changes which were capable of being implemented before ratification of the revised Convention should be, because the new structure was important for revitalizing IHO and making it more relevant for the future. The terms of reference for the various bodies had been framed to cover the transition phase pending the establishment of the Assembly and Council.

Captain SOBOLEV (Russian Federation) supported the amendment. Nothing could be done without risk.

The PRESIDENT said he took it that the Conference accepted the amendment.

It was so agreed.

PRO 9, as amended, was adopted.

PRO 10 - CHAIRMANSHIP OF THE HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES AND STANDARDS COMMITTEE (HSSC) AND THE INTER-REGIONAL COORDINATION COMMITTEE (IRCC) (CONF.17/DOC.1)

Commander KLEPSVIK (Norway), Chairman of the SPWG, explained that the aim of the proposal was to ensure continuity in the transition process.

The PRESIDENT pointed out that the amendment to PRO 9 applied equally to PRO 10. Consequently, the phrase “at the latest” should be inserted after “1 January 2009”.

PRO 10, as amended, was adopted.

PRO 11 - ACTIONS FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF RE-STRUCTURING OF THE IHO COMMITTEES AND OTHER GROUPS

Commander KLEPSVIK (Norway), Chairman of the SPWG, introduced the proposal.

The PRESIDENT noted that the comments received from Member States before the Conference had all been in favour of the proposal.

IGA BESSERO (France) pointed out an inconsistency with PRO 2, where the words “the IHB Directing Committee” had now been replaced by “the IHB”.

The PRESIDENT said he had received a proposal from the Chairman of the SPWG to delete the words “Directing Committee”. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Conference wished to adopt the proposal as amended.

PRO 11, as amended, was adopted.

PRO 12 - ESTABLISHMENT OF A WORKING GROUP TO REVISE THE IHO STRATEGIC PLAN (CONF.17/DOC.1 – ANNEX L)

Commander KLEPSVIK (Norway), Chairman of the SPWG, said that the SPWG had concluded that the Strategic Plan approved at the XVIth IHC in 2002 needed thorough revision. The points set out in Annex L of the report could form the basis of the Terms of Reference of a Working Group responsible for considering the Strategic Plan and recommending changes. The SPWG believed it had accomplished its mandate within the terms of reference set for it by the XVIth Conference. It was now for the Conference to decide whether revision of the Strategic Plan should be undertaken by the SPWG, with new terms of reference, or by another working group.

The PRESIDENT drew attention to the comments by Member States on the proposal, three of which dealt with the composition of the working group in question. Australia had suggested that the SPWG should undertake the revision of the Strategic Plan; Brazil commented that the composition of the Group should be similar to that of the future Council; and France recommended that the Group should be modelled on the SPWG. Two other comments related to the ToRs of the Working Group. The Netherlands had urged close cooperation between the Group, the Directing Committee and the Chairmen of the developing HSSC and the IRCC. An amendment had been received from the United States of America to some of the wording in Annex L.

Captain WARD (Australia) added that the mechanisms of the SPWG had the advantage of providing wide regional representation.

IGA BESSERO (France) commented that France's view, which had been correctly summed up by the President, was only worth considering once the principle of setting up a working group had been accepted.

Captain DE HAAN (Netherlands) stressed the importance of revising the Strategic Plan. He agreed with Australia that the revision should be done by the SPWG with new ToRs. It was important to ensure effective cooperation between the Group, the Directing Committee and the developing HSSC and IRCC, for the sake of securing consistency within the Organization and approval of the Group's recommendations at the next EIHC.

The PRESIDENT said that the comments of the Netherlands and of the United States would be taken into account when discussing the terms of reference of the Group. It did seem to be the wish of the Conference to establish such a group, and there was certainly a need to review the Strategic Plan. There were in essence two potential amendments: the one from Brazil, for a working group constituted by selection from the Member States on the basis of tonnage and RHCs, like the future Council; and the proposal that the SPWG should be asked to continue its work, but with revised ToRs. He invited comments on the Brazilian proposal.

Dr. NARAYANAN (Canada) was in favour of revising the Strategic Plan and setting up a working group. She did not agree with the Brazilian proposal for the composition of the Group, because all Member States should be given the opportunity to participate. The Chairman and Vice-Chairmen should be appointed by the Member States, for example through Circular Letters. It did not much matter what the group was called, but since it would have new ToRs, probably a new Chairman and new Vice-Chairmen and possibly new members, in some senses it would be a new working group even under the old name. Canada was interested in contributing to the activities of the new group.

Mr. SPITTAL (New Zealand) agreed that the working group should be open to all Member States. However, he was concerned by any suggestion that the SPWG should continue. Committees that had finished their work should go out of existence. He was in favour of winding up the SPWG and allowing a new group to take over, with a defined period in office.

Rear Admiral ANDREASEN (United States of America) agreed. His delegation wished to see a reduction in the number of meetings held by the new group and its cost by comparison with the SPWG. SPWG had produced no simplification of structure, rather the reverse.

Mr. VARONEN (Finland) was not in favour of constituting the group like a council, as proposed by Brazil. He preferred the original proposal by France to model the group on the SPWG, since Finland's experience of the work of the SPWG had been very positive.

The PRESIDENT asked whether any delegation apart from that of Uruguay wished to support the amendment proposed by Brazil.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT invited the Conference to consider the comments by Australia and France.

Dr. NARAYANAN (Canada) said Canada supported the abolition of the SPWG and the formation of a new group. She agreed with the delegations of New Zealand and the United States that such groups should not remain in existence indefinitely. Regardless of its name the working group would be a new group, with new ToRs, new membership, and a new chairman and vice-chairman. Noting that many meetings held by the SPWG had been very costly, she emphasized that more of the intersessional work should be done through electronic media.

The PRESIDENT enquired whether Australia agreed with the comment by France, calling for the new working group to be set up on the model of the SPWG.

Captain NAIRN (Australia) said his delegation could agree to that.

The PRESIDENT invited comments on the suggestion by France, the only one now under consideration.

Professor EHLERS (Germany) said the tasks and composition of the new working group were not sufficiently clear. He suggested setting up a small drafting group to draw up ToRs for the group. It could then be decided whether the group would be a new one or a continuation of the SPWG. Given the crucial importance of its work, its chairman should be appointed by the Conference, not by the members of the group.

Rear Admiral MONCRIEFF (United Kingdom) endorsed the suggestion of setting up a drafting group. The new group should have clear parameters for its work, so that it could draw up a sound strategic plan.

Captain SOBOLEV (Russia) also supported the suggestion by the delegation of Germany.

The PRESIDENT said that, as there appeared to be general support for the idea, a drafting group would be set up to draw up ToRs for the working group. In the meantime, discussion of Proposal 12 would be suspended.

It was so agreed.

The PRESIDENT, having called for volunteers, announced that the drafting group would consist of one member each from the delegations of Brazil, Canada, France, Italy, the United Kingdom and the United States of America.

PRO 13 - EDITORIAL AMENDMENTS TO THE HOST AGREEMENT

Commander KLEPSVIK (Norway), Chairman of the SPWG, introduced the proposal. The PRESIDENT observed that all the comments received expressed support for the proposal. Did any delegation wish to comment further?

Mr. DOHERTY (United States of America) suggested that, for the sake of consistency with the language of other proposals, the words "Directing Committee" should be deleted. The proposal would then read "The Conference is requested to direct the President of the IHB, following approval of the amendments to the IHO Convention, to liaise with the Monegasque Government to make any necessary editorial amendments to the Host Agreement and to present the result to MS by Circular Letter".

The PRESIDENT said he would take it that the Conference wished to adopt the proposal, as amended by the delegation of the United States.

PRO 13, as amended, was adopted.

PRO 14 - AMENDMENTS TO TECHNICAL RESOLUTION T1.1

Commander KLEPSVIK (Norway), Chairman of the SPWG, explained that it was necessary to amend Technical Resolution T1.1 in order to bring it into line with Articles 6 and 8 of the amended General Regulations. As the Conference had approved the advance entry into force of the restructuring of IHO committees and other groups, by 1 January 2009 at the latest (PRO 9), the amendments to Resolution T1.1 should also enter into force by the same date. The amendments would remain in effect until the amendments to the Convention were ratified and the new IHO structure was fully implemented.

The PRESIDENT assured the delegation of France that the IHB would be asked to make the editorial corrections which it had requested to the French text of the amendments to Resolution T1.1. He invited the delegation of the United Kingdom to comment on its proposed amendment to PRO 14.

Mr. HOOTON (United Kingdom) said paragraph 5(d) of the proposed amendments to Technical Resolution T1.1 should be deleted, and instead introduced as an amendment to paragraph 3 of Technical Resolution T1.2. Paragraph 5(d) dealt with the representation of the IHO in other fora. That question was covered by Resolution T1.2, not Resolution T1.1, which dealt with internal bodies of the IHO.

His delegation was also concerned that paragraphs 6(ii) and 6(iii) implied that the Finance Committee and other subsidiary organs were empowered to establish sub-committees and working groups. As that was not the case, the first line of those two paragraphs should be amended to read "When proposing the establishment of". Finally, the numbering system in paragraph 6 should be consistent with that in paragraph 5.

The PRESIDENT enquired whether Member States accepted the amendments proposed by the United Kingdom.

IGA BESSERO (France) agreed that paragraph 5(d) should be deleted from Technical Resolution T1.1. The wording of Technical Resolution T1.2 did not need changing until the new structure of the IHO came into being.

Mr. HECHT (Germany) observed that under the amended General Regulations, the Finance Committee and other subsidiary organs would be authorized to establish subordinate bodies. He suggested that the Conference should implement that change forthwith by authorizing the Finance Committee and other subsidiary organs to establish sub-committees or working groups.

The PRESIDENT asked the representative of Germany to clarify his suggestion for paragraphs 6(i) and 6(ii).

Mr. HECHT (Germany) said the wording of those paragraphs should be made consistent with that of Article 6(a) of the amended General Regulations, by which the Assembly could authorize the Finance Committee or any subsidiary organ to establish subordinate bodies.

Mr. SAHEB-ETTABA (Canada) wondered whether the proposal by Germany would entail an amendment to the General Regulations. If so, the approval of two-thirds of Member States would be required, which would introduce an unnecessary complication. He was therefore in favour of the proposal by the United Kingdom.

The PRESIDENT enquired whether the delegation of Germany was proposing to amend the existing General Regulations.

Mr. HECHT (Germany) said his intention was to give as much authority as possible to the bodies carrying out the day-to-day work of the Organization. That had also been the intention in amending the General Regulations. If the Conference took the view that authorizing subsidiary organs to establish bodies subordinate to themselves would require a formal amendment of the General Regulations, his delegation would accept the amendment by the United Kingdom. That would, however, mean that, in future, the establishment of subordinate bodies would always be a matter for the Conference.

IGA BESSERO (France) said it would not be necessary to amend the General Regulations. The Conference could authorize the Finance Committee and other subsidiary organs to establish subordinate bodies by adopting the amendment set out in PRO 14.

Having summarized the proposed amendments and the comments on them, the PRESIDENT asked the Conference to consider first the editorial changes suggested by the United Kingdom. He took it that everyone agreed with those changes.

It was so agreed.

Turning to the proposed amendments to paragraphs 6(ii) and 6(iii), he asked whether the Conference agreed to replace the words “When establishing” by “When proposing the establishment of”.

It was so agreed.

With regard to the amendments proposed for paragraph 5(d), he asked whether the United Kingdom agreed that Technical Resolution T1.2 did not require amendment.

Mr. HOOTON (United Kingdom) said his delegation was prepared to leave Technical Resolution T1.2 unchanged, merely deleting paragraph 5(d) of Technical Resolution T1.1.

The PRESIDENT asked whether the Conference agreed to make that deletion.

It was so agreed.

Proposal 14, as amended, was adopted.

The PRESIDENT said that Proposal 15 had been withdrawn by Australia, and the Conference would now consider Proposal 16, submitted by Germany.

PRO 16 - AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 6 OF THE GENERAL REGULATIONS, AND TO RULE 5 OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR IHO CONFERENCES REGARDING OBSERVERS, SO AS TO COMPLY WITH EIHC 3 DECISION No. 5.

Mr. HECHT (Germany) recalled the decision of the 3rd Extraordinary International Hydrographic Conference that only Non-governmental International Organizations (NGIOs) could be granted observer status, and that only those accredited by the IHO could attend meetings of IHO bodies (EIHC 3 Decision No. 5). That decision, however, had not been implemented for this Conference, because its provisions had not been incorporated into the current General Regulations or into the Rules of Procedure of the IHO Conferences. Article 6 of the General Regulations and Rule 5 of the Rules of Procedure of the Conference should therefore be amended.

The PRESIDENT noted that several Member States had submitted written comments, all of them supporting the proposal.

Rear Admiral ANDREASEN (United States of America) said his delegation did not oppose PRO 16. Some non-governmental organizations at national level might however prove to be useful partners for capacity building, and it might be desirable to consider admitting them as observers. Without wishing to propose an amendment that would be inconsistent with EIHC 3 Decision No. 5, awarding observer status to such organizations should not be ruled out.

Mr. HECHT (Germany) pointed out that representatives of national NGOs could be included in national delegations and participate by that means in meetings of IHO bodies.

Dr. NISHIDA (Japan) said that although his delegation had not fully supported EIHC 3 Decision No. 5, it did not oppose PRO 16. In its present composition, his delegation included a representative of a national NGO.

The PRESIDENT said that, in the absence of other comments, he would take it that the Conference wished to adopt the proposal.

Mr. SAHEB-ETTABA (Canada) pointed out that, as the proposal called for an amendment of the General Regulations, its adoption would require the approval of at least two-thirds of Member States.

Following a count, the PRESIDENT announced that 66 Member States with voting rights were present. The total number of Member States with voting rights was 75, making the required two-thirds majority 50 votes. He asked if any Member States opposed the proposal.

With 66 votes in favour, PRO 16 was adopted.

Rapporteur : Mr. Keith E. ALEXANDER (United States of America)

CONTENTS

Consideration of proposals (Agenda item 3) (continued)

- PRO 12 -Establishment of a Working Group to revise the IHO Strategic Plan (continued)
- PRO 17 -Cancelling a Conference decision
- PRO 18 -Provision of Regional Staff Officers for Capacity Building effort
- PRO 19 -Establishment of a Working Group to study and propose a new edition of the IHB Staff Regulations
- PRO 20 -Establishment of a Working Group on Hydrography and Cartography of Inland Waters
- PRO 21 - A Resolution on ENC Coverage in relation to ECDIS Carriage Requirements

CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSALS SUBMITTED BY THE SPWG (CONF.17/G/02 and Add.1) (Agenda item 3) (continued)

PRO 12 - ESTABLISHMENT OF A WORKING GROUP TO REVISE THE IHO STRATEGIC PLAN (continued)

The PRESIDENT presented a new text from the drafting group to replace the proposal of the SPWG. It read as follows:

- Working Group to develop IHO Strategic Plan
- Proposed name: IHO Strategic Plan Working Group (ISPWG)

Terms of Reference

- Review the existing IHO Strategic Plan in view of IHO's new vision, mission and objectives.
- Prepare a revised draft Strategic Plan.
- Present the draft Strategic Plan and any related recommendations to the Member States no later than 1 January 2009.

Composition

The Working Group will comprise representatives designated by the Regional Hydrographic Commissions. Individual Member States may be represented if they consider it necessary. The IHB shall be represented in the Working Group.

Chair

Chair and Vice-Chair shall be elected by the Conference.

Working method

The Working Group shall encourage maximum participation by working mainly by correspondence, using information technology, and with no more than two face-to-face meetings of the full membership.

The proposed new text for PRO 12 was adopted.

The PRESIDENT called for nominations for Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Working Group established by PRO 12.

IGA BESSERO (France), supported by Dr NARAYANAN (Canada) and Mr. HOOTON (United Kingdom) said nominations should be made by the next session of the Conference.

Mr. SPITTAL (New Zealand) added that, in view of the travel and expense involved, it would take time for him to obtain authority to volunteer for such a post.

The PRESIDENT agreed that nominations for Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the IHO Strategic Plan Working Group could be made at the next session of the Conference.

All the proposals made by the SPWG having thus been addressed, he congratulated its Chairman on accomplishing a huge amount of fundamental work in the space of only five years. It had been a model of effective cooperation.

Commander KLEPSVIK (Norway), Chairman of the SPWG, said the Working Group had to meet significant challenges, but had proved to be cost-effective and to yield satisfactory results. Its broad membership among Member States had been instrumental in achieving consensus.

CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSALS SUBMITTED BY THE IHO MEMBER STATES (CONF.17/G/02 and Add.1) (Agenda item 3) (continued)

PRO 17 - CANCELLING A CONFERENCE DECISION

Captain QUIRÓS CEBRIÀ (Spain), introducing the proposal, said that Decision 5 of the 2nd Extraordinary International Conference had become superfluous, because the rules of procedure of the IHO Assembly stipulated that it would meet every three years. Moreover, two Member States believed that Decision 5 was unconstitutional. If ratification of the new Convention proceeded as hoped, only one extraordinary conference would be required before the Convention came into force, and that would be held in 2009, on the basis of a decision to be taken by the present Conference. Article VI.1 of the present Convention envisaged the possibility of convening extraordinary conferences.

Captain WARD (Australia) said that conferences on a more frequent basis than every five years could not be introduced by way of Decision 5, which was unconstitutional. Constitutional lawyers in his country had advised him that the Organization could not decide to hold regular extraordinary

conferences. The term 'extraordinary' meant that a special decision had been taken. Decision 5 should therefore be cancelled.

Professor EHLERS (Germany) agreed that a decision to hold regular extraordinary conferences would be problematic from a legal point of view. Decision 5 should be cancelled, but the Conference should decide to hold an extraordinary conference in 2009 to address strategic matters, together with the status of the protocol of amendments and related measures.

The PRESIDENT added that the proposed extraordinary conference should consider the results of the work of the new IHO Strategic Plan Working Group, and vote on the new structure proposed for the IHO.

In the light of the proposal by the delegation of Germany, Rear Admiral MONCRIEFF (United Kingdom) withdrew his country's objection to PRO 17.

Commander KLEPSVIK (Norway) and Captain QUIRÓS CEBRIÀ (Spain) also supported the proposal by Germany.

The PRESIDENT asked the Conference whether it wished to amend PRO 17 by deciding to call an extraordinary international conference in 2009 to consider the outcomes of the IHO Strategic Plan Working Group and the status of agreement with regard to the proposed new structure.

That proposal was adopted.

PRO 18 - PROVISION OF REGIONAL STAFF OFFICERS FOR CAPACITY BUILDING EFFORT

Captain BARRITT (United Kingdom), speaking in his capacity as Vice-Chairman of the IHO Capacity Building Committee (CBC), said that there appeared to be consensus that the proposal should be referred to the CBC, provided the CBC worked in consultation with the RHCs. He nevertheless hoped that the proposal would stimulate discussion of the demand for human resources entailed for the RHCs by Capacity Building. Task 2.3.2 of the proposed 5-year work programme for the period 2008-2012 (CONF.17/REP/01 Rev.1) called for technical workshops, seminars and short courses. Several of the comments on his delegation's proposal reflected a concern that it would make the work of the CBC more bureaucratic. However, no permanent or long-term posts were being proposed. On the contrary, the proposal sought to introduce a flexible means of seconding personnel, involving minimal cost in return for a substantial output. He urged the Conference to view the proposal as reflecting a mechanism that had been shown to work and could be replicated, instead of dwelling on the difficulties it might present.

Captain KAMPFER (South Africa) said his delegation supported the proposal. It was the RHCs and their chairmen that made the IHO work, but many RHCs had only limited human resources for capacity building.

Mr. SPITTAL (New Zealand), speaking as the Chairman of the South West Pacific Hydrographic Commission, said his delegation endorsed the proposal by the United Kingdom. Many countries in the Pacific region had very limited human resources for hydrography. Even in his own country, the five staff available were also responsible for national hydrography. The terms and conditions for seconding personnel to act as regional staff officers should be carefully thought through.

Rear Admiral ANDREASEN (United States of America) said that if the RHCs were truly autonomous, it was improper for this Conference to decide that RHCs shall have regional staff officers from the CBC. A decision to second personnel should be an internal matter for the CBC to consider in conjunction with each RHC.

Captain IBARRA (Chile) congratulated the representative of the United Kingdom on his commitment, adding that his delegation supported the proposal.

Captain SUAREZ (Venezuela) also gave the proposal her full support. She suggested that discussions should be held in each RHC to determine its requirements and evaluate its available potential.

Commander PROAÑO SILVA (Ecuador), speaking as the Chairman of the South East Pacific Hydrographic Commission, said the proposal was a positive one, and should be extended to include capacity building with respect to rivers.

Dr. ESTIRI (Islamic Republic of Iran) also supported the proposal.

Rear Admiral RAO (India) said he was concerned at the prospect of extra bureaucracy in the work of the CBC. In the past 2 years there had been an expansion of capacity in the North Indian Ocean Hydrographic Commission, and several bilateral surveys had been carried out. India offered various possibilities for training, including a hydrographic school. Financial assistance would be required, but it would be preferable to train persons from the region rather than bringing in personnel from elsewhere.

Admiral ABRAMOV (Russian Federation) said the proposal should first be considered by the CBC, then by the RHCs and finally by Member States.

Captain QUIRÓS CEBRIÁ (Spain) supported the proposal. Attending the 2006 EAthC Conference in Dakar, Senegal, enabled him to see for himself the situation in the countries of that region, and why they needed to channel human and financial resources efficiently in order to provide hydrographic capacity. He paid tribute to the work done by the current Vice-Chairman of the CBC.

Rear Admiral MONCRIEFF (United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of his own delegation and as Chairman of the NIOHC, supported the proposal. The CBC had made significant progress, and when the current Vice-Chairman steps down much effort would be needed to sustain the momentum it had developed. The work of an RHC Chairman demanded time and effort. Support from IHO through an appropriate mechanism would be valuable and should not prove costly. However, if possible, it should come from within each region. Capacity building was an important IHO activity of benefit to the safety of life at sea, and should be made widely known. It would not be appropriate for IHO to shed its responsibility in that area.

Captain GORZIGLIA (Director IHB) said systematic capacity building activities had begun only in 2004, following the establishment of the Capacity Building Committee, which had been followed in 2005 by the Capacity Building Fund. The activities had been successful precisely because countries had offered support, for example by seconding staff. However, Member States must be open to innovation at a time when the Organization was being restructured, and more support for capacity building was needed in order to make the most of the progress achieved to date. The current Vice-Chairman of the CBC had done much to take matters forward in the RHCs but, as the previous speaker had said, steps must be taken to ensure that the activities continued after he stepped down. Clearly, the various RHCs had different needs; some required no additional support, while others required help in mobilizing resources and with tasks such as drafting letters. A flexible approach would be needed, and the proposal offered one way of proceeding.

Commodore ABULU (Nigeria), supporting the proposal, confirmed that some RHCs needed support so that the Chairman's workload could be lightened. He also felt that governments might pay more attention to hydrographic matters if support staff were connected with an international body such as IHO. The CBC should be asked to consider how the proposed scheme should operate.

Mr. OEI (Singapore), speaking as Chairman of the East Asia Hydrographic Commission, expressed his appreciation of the support received from the CBC in setting up a regional capacity building

committee. Capacity building activities could not be sustained without a proper framework. It was obvious that the RHCs had different capacities and needs: the IHO should develop a more holistic and cooperative approach, the stronger nations supporting the less fortunate. Such an approach was especially important at a time when navigational issues, such as the IMO mandatory ECDIS carriage requirements, were becoming more prominent, leaving less time for hydrographic capacity building.

The PRESIDENT, on the basis of the written comments received, suggested that the words “to urge Member States” in PRO 18 should be replaced by “ask the Capacity Building Committee”.

Captain BARRITT (United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of the United Kingdom and as Vice-Chairman of the CBC, proposed that the replacement wording should read “ask the Capacity Building Committee, in consultation with the RHCs”. Future ideas must come from the RHCs, which would be responsible for delivering regional activities.

IGA BESSERO (France) supported the President’s proposal, as amended by the representative of the United Kingdom. It reflected the new Terms of Reference of the IRCC.

Rear Admiral ANDREASEN (United States of America) endorsed the remarks by the representative of the United Kingdom, and paid tribute to his work as Vice-Chairman of the CBC.

Dr. GRŽETIČ (Croatia) agreed with the remarks by the representatives of the United Kingdom and France.

The PRESIDENT said that, in the absence of any objection, he would take it that the Conference approved the amendment he had proposed, as further amended by the representative of the United Kingdom.

The amendment was adopted.

PRO 18, as amended, was adopted.

PRO 19 - ESTABLISHMENT OF A WORKING GROUP TO STUDY AND PROPOSE A NEW EDITION OF THE IHB STAFF REGULATIONS

The PRESIDENT OF THE DIRECTING COMMITTEE, introducing the proposal, said that since their inception in 1974 the Staff Regulations had evolved through a series of Conference decisions and Directing Committee modifications, and were currently in their seventh edition. A preliminary review by the IHB had revealed a number of errors and inconsistencies. In addition, the proposed structural changes would necessitate amendments. The Directing Committee was therefore proposing the establishment of a working group to conduct a holistic review of the Staff Regulations and to recommend appropriate changes.

The PRESIDENT drew attention to a comment received from France, supporting the proposal while recommending due care to ensure a full range of the necessary skills in the working group.

Rear Admiral MONCRIEFF (United Kingdom) suggested including in the proposal some indication when the working group should complete its task. The timing should be appropriately related to the transition from IHB to Secretariat.

The PRESIDENT said that if the working group were established, it would report well in advance of the next EIHC in 2009.

Captain IBARRA (Chile) suggested that instead of having a new working group, the ISPWG could be asked to review the Staff Regulations.

The PRESIDENT pointed out the ISPWG already had a heavy workload, which did not cover personnel matters. If the proposal to set up a working group was approved, the IHB would issue a Circular Letter requesting nominations to serve on the group. The nominees should be appropriately qualified.

Captain WARD (Australia), supporting the proposal in principle, asked for further clarification of the timetable for the working group, the body to which it would report and its likely Terms of Reference. The latter should be determined by the body to which it would report, so that if the group reported to the Conference, the XVIIth Conference would decide on its Terms of Reference.

The PRESIDENT replied that the working group would be required to prepare proposals eight months prior to the EIHC in 2009. He suggested that a drafting group open to all interested parties should meet immediately to consider the Terms of Reference.

It was so agreed.

The PRESIDENT reported on the text of the Terms of Reference for the working group to review the Staff Regulations, as framed by the drafting group, which read:

Name: Staff Regulations Working Group

Terms of Reference:

1. Conduct a holistic review of the existing IHB Staff Regulations.
2. Propose any changes to the Staff Regulations necessary to administer the IHB effectively, using consistent and internationally accepted procedures.
3. Propose any additional changes to the Staff Regulations that would be necessary upon implementation of the new Secretariat organization.
4. Provide a report on its work [to the 4th Extraordinary International Hydrographic Conference in 2009/by Circular Letter].

Chairman and Vice-Chairman:

To be determined by this Conference.

Membership:

This Working Group is open to all Member States.

The IHB shall be represented in the Working Group.

Working Method:

The Working Group shall encourage maximum participation by working mainly by correspondence using information technology, with face-to face meetings of the full membership no more than necessary.

Rear Admiral ANDREASEN (United States of America) found the text acceptable. As for the alternatives in square brackets, he would prefer the working group to report by circular letter, in order to avoid delay, and also to ensure that those qualified in personnel matters, rather than the hydrographers attending the EIHC, would take part in the review process.

Rear Admiral MONCRIEFF (United Kingdom) agreed. The views of the IHB staff should be sought, and the working group should have direct access to the staff.

The PRESIDENT OF THE DIRECTING COMMITTEE said that under the current Staff Regulations there was a Staff Regulations Committee chaired by the President of the Directing Committee. Various categories of IHB staff were represented on it. The Directing Committee would ensure similar staff participation in the proposed Working Group.

The PRESIDENT said the second of the two bracketed alternatives seemed to be preferred, but it should be amended to “by Circular Letter in 2009”.

IGA BESSERO (France) supported the amended text.

The amended text was adopted.

PRO 19, as amended, was adopted.

The PRESIDENT stated that nominations for Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Staff Regulations Working Group would be made at the next session of the Conference.

PRO 20 - ESTABLISHMENT OF A WORKING GROUP ON HYDROGRAPHY AND CARTOGRAPHY OF INLAND WATERS (CONF.17/G/02 Add.1)

Rear Admiral DI VINCENZO (Argentina), introducing the proposal, said that the inland navigable waters were gaining in significance worldwide, and there was a need for international hydrographic and cartographic standards for those waters. IHO should establish a working group on the subject, which should take account of other work being done elsewhere.

The PRESIDENT OF THE DIRECTING COMMITTEE said a letter about the proposal had been received from a representative of Austria currently serving as one of the Chairmen of the Inland ENC Harmonization Group (IEHG). The aim of the IEHG was to develop and maintain a harmonized standard for inland electronic navigational charts based on IHO standards. The letter indicated that the IEHG had good relations with CHRIS, and was concerned that IEHG might overlap with the proposed group.

The PRESIDENT recalled that when dealing with proposal 15, on the Terms of Reference of the ISPWG, the question of inland waterways had been raised by the delegation of the United States, which had agreed to postpone further discussion until proposal 20 was taken up.

Dr. MUSKATIROVIC (Serbia) supported the proposal, which was of great importance for countries with inland waterways. Those countries should play a full part in the work of IHO and work closely with IHO standards. In support of the position of Austria, she suggested that instead of setting up a new body, IHO should find a way of coordinating and guiding the work of existing groups.

Captain WARD (Australia), speaking as the Chairman of CHRIS, supported the proposal. The sponsors of the proposal had highlighted the need to coordinate the charting of inland and estuarine waterways with that of the high seas. CHRIS was already collaborating successfully with organizations such as the IEHG, through its relevant technical working groups. The proposal to establish an IHO working group was therefore timely. The group should decide what role IHO should play in relation to inland waters, and should preferably report to CHRIS. It would be important to establish a deadline for reporting. The proposal included Terms of Reference for the group. If the group was to report to CHRIS, the proposed Terms of Reference should be refined within the structure of CHRIS.

IGA BESSERO (France) urged caution in extending the scope of IHO activities. Doing so might have far-reaching consequences. There was no international regulatory body for inland waterways equivalent to IMO for the high seas. Most inland waterways were regulated nationally or through bilateral agreements. Moreover, IHO might not possess the necessary capacities. In France, for example, the national hydrographic service was not responsible for inland waterways. It would be preferable to respond to countries having specific needs in relation to inland waterways, without taking full responsibility for them, especially bearing in mind that IHO had not yet met all the challenges in the maritime sphere. The implications of inland navigation should be considered by the ISPWG, and a decision on the proposal should be postponed until the EIHC in 2009.

Captain CAVALHEIRO (Brazil) said that Brazil was sponsoring the proposal because of the need to coordinate the growing number of bilateral agreements relating to inland waterways, as well as the technical aspects of their hydrography and cartography. The new Convention stated that all Member States of the United Nations were eligible for membership of the IHO. That would include non-coastal states and IHO ought to be in a position to support hydrographic and cartographic capacity building in those countries. He supported the proposals that the working group should report to CHRIS and that the outcome should be submitted to the EIHC in 2009.

Captain IBARRA (Chile) agreed. He supported the proposal.

Dr. ESTIRI (Islamic Republic of Iran) agreed that IHO should consider its attitude towards developing standards for inland waterways. He suggested setting up a small study group to discuss the proposal in detail and make a report.

Professor EHLERS (Germany) supported the view that IHO should take a cautious approach to the question of inland waterways. The proposal before Conference had been submitted at a late stage, and there had been little opportunity to reflect and comment on its implications or to discuss the matter with the national organizations responsible. Until now IHO had concentrated on maritime safety, and to extend its remit to inland waterways would alter its character. The problems of inland water traffic might best be solved on a regional basis among the countries concerned, as in the Central Commission for the Rhine, rather than at the global level. Member States would have to make a positive decision if they wished the Organization to take on new responsibilities of that kind. He therefore was in favour of setting up a working group on the question, to undertake a preliminary investigation of the situation to identify the problems involved and how and by whom they were currently resolved. It would then decide whether coordination through IHO would improve matters and add value to the Organization. It was essential to avoid duplication of work and conflict with existing organizations. The Working Group should report to the 2009 EIHC, which should consider how best to proceed.

Captain SUAREZ (Venezuela) supported the proposal by Argentina. Although many countries such as hers had national bodies responsible for inland waterways, the time had come to develop and maintain international standards.

Admiral ABRAMOV (Russian Federation) acknowledged the importance of the proposal and mentioned the problem of worldwide electronic chart coverage. His country had a national body with specific responsibility for its vast expanses of inland waterways. However, he agreed with the delegations of France and Germany that caution was needed in expanding the scope of IHO's activities. The question should be referred to a future Conference.

Captain PEREYRA (Uruguay), supporting the proposal, said that, in essence, the mission of IHO extended to all navigable waters. Most countries already had adequate regulations and authorities responsible for inland navigation, but some did not. Guidelines were needed, in particular, for passage from maritime to inland waters, to avoid misinterpretation of charts. Moreover, maritime Electronic Navigational Charts (ENCs) would not contain all the necessary data to cover inland waters. However, the deadline proposed for the working group might be too short.

Rear Admiral ANDREASEN (United States of America) mentioned the constant pressure for increased ENC coverage and the need to harmonize maritime spatial data. Steps should be taken to incorporate the inland ENCs developed by the Inland ENC Harmonization Group (IEHG) into IHO's S-100 standards, and indeed to accommodate IEHG itself within the group to be established. Member States should be encouraged to include in their delegations to the IHC authorities responsible for inland waterways. Non-IHO Member States, such as those in the Great Lakes region in Africa, had navigation problems that could be dealt with only by IHO.

Rear Admiral ZEGARRA (Peru) supported the proposal. His country had an authority for the hydrography and cartography of inland waters. However, there was a need to develop international standards and capacities in the matter.

Captain KAMPFER (South Africa) supported the proposal. It was high time attention was given to inland navigation. The African continent, for example, had a vast network of inland waters and navigable rivers that were poorly surveyed and had witnessed serious accidents and considerable loss of life.

Rear Admiral MONCRIEFF (United Kingdom) acknowledged the importance of the question while urging caution in establishing a working group to deal with it. It was important to recognize the interests of non-IHO Member States and those of regulatory national bodies for inland waterways, also bearing in mind the existing common charting standards for waters linked to the high seas and navigable by seagoing vessels, for example, the ongoing work under the European "Lorelei" project. All those aspects should first be examined, and only then should IHO identify a possible role for itself and decide whether a working group was needed and what form it should take. The Terms of Reference of any such group should take full account of the work of the IEHG.

Captain NAIRN (Australia) said that the level of IHO involvement in inland waterways clearly needed careful consideration. He was in favour of setting up the proposed working group to study the question and report to CHRIS, which was the most appropriate body to finalize the Terms of Reference and supervise the work.

Captain CAVALHEIRO (Brazil) agreed. As for safety of navigation, many countries needed the support of the IHO Capacity Building Committee, which had a mandate, among other things, to encourage countries to establish national hydrographic committees.

Commander KLEPSVIK (Norway) said that nothing in the Convention or its amendments precluded the extension of IHO's activities to inland navigation. The concerns of Germany and France, which he shared, about the implications of expanding IHO's work into that area, could be met by confining the Terms of Reference of the working group to those in paragraph (a), and requesting it to report to the 4th EIHC in 2009. At that point, the Terms of Reference could be further developed.

Mr. BIANCO (Observer for Malta) commented that the term "inland waters" covered all waters within the national baseline.

The PRESIDENT said that some inland waters formed the boundary between two countries, and were therefore international.

Summing up the discussion, he said it was generally agreed that the proposal dealt with a question of policy, and was of exceptional importance. It should be taken forward, although with a degree of caution. The most appropriate forum to deal with it was the CHRIS Committee, which should submit a set of recommendations to IHC, possibly the 4th EIHC. He suggested that the proposal should be left pending and that a drafting group should revise the proposed Terms of Reference in the light of the discussion, and submit new wording to the Conference at a subsequent session.

It was so agreed.

PRO 21 - A RESOLUTION ON ENC COVERAGE IN RELATION TO ECDIS CARRIAGE REQUIREMENTS (CONF.17/G/02 Add.1)

Commander KLEPSVIK (Norway) explained that the proposed resolution was based on ongoing activities in IMO aimed at making ECDIS a mandatory carriage requirement. The task would be carried out by IMO's Sub-Committee on Navigation (NAV) at two meetings, NAV53 in 2007 and NAV54 in 2008, reporting back to the IMO Maritime Safety Committee (MSC). It was evident that ENC coverage in general, and "suitable" coverage in particular, would be a major issue for IMO. Meanwhile IHO, because of its recognized competence for nautical chart issues, had an important role to play in the forthcoming discussion. IMO's plans for a mandatory ECDIS carriage requirement would be a strong incentive for States, including States not yet Members of IHO, that had not yet produced ENCs to do so.

The maritime administrations and Hydrographic Offices of Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden had tasked Det Norske Veritas (DNV) to assess the impact of ENC coverage on ECDIS risk reduction. Its report, the conclusions of which were summarized in the explanatory note to the proposal, was posted on the IHO website.

Rear Admiral MONCRIEFF (United Kingdom) made the following statement: This "DNV" comprehensive analysis is welcomed. It is in line with the analysis completed by the UKHO of the major shipping routes in which we also include the top 800 ports that account for 95% of the World's DWT - and therefore it is very much at the core of how the IHO has defined hydrographic interest. UK believes that some of the figures relating to coverage maybe on the optimistic side, but would not quibble with the thrust of some gradual improvement in ENC coverage. Global coverage is only one of the shipping companies' requirements. Research and listening carefully to their concerns reveal that we also need to simultaneously address their long-standing push for lower prices that are competitive with unofficial products and to also offer more responsive licensing arrangements. Such a response must match an on-demand call to deliver services for the routes they want, as and when they need them, and, if necessary, while on the move. We have also to address the need of those who navigate and stand watch on bridges for a seamless vector chart service that is consistent as they take passage from one side of the World to the other. While supporting the proposal in principle, he did not believe it answered all the questions to which IMO would expect a response from IHO. The matter could be discussed again in the context of the agenda item on the Worldwide Electronic Navigational Database (WEND).

Captain WARD (Australia) supported the proposal. PRO21, and much of the reasoning behind PRO 23, dealt with the single most important issue facing IHO and Hydrographic Offices. IHO had to deliver coherent, consistent and reliable ENC coverage to mariners throughout the world, and unless that was achieved in the relatively near future, the very purpose of the Hydrographic Offices would be in question, and indeed that of IHO itself.

Dr. NISHIDA (Japan) drew attention to the proposal contained in PRO 23, which also addressed ENC coverage, availability, consistency and quality, and should therefore be considered in conjunction with PRO 21.

IGA BESSERO (France) acknowledged the importance of the question. He agreed with Japan that a consistent approach should be adopted to the two proposals, and also to the proposals submitted by the Directing Committee in CL42/2007.

Professor EHLERS (Germany), supporting the proposal, said that the future of IHO would depend on whether ECDIS services could be successfully delivered. The time had come to send a signal to the international maritime community that IHO supported and believed in ECDIS. PRO 23 was additional to PRO 21, which could well be addressed first.

Mr. SAHEB-ETTABA (Canada) was reluctant to intrude into an area in which IMO, with a much broader membership than IHO, was already working. It was a matter of courtesy towards IMO Member States that were not members of IHO and might have difficulties in accepting certain mandatory requirements. There was no reason to discuss the two proposals together. PRO 21 had a bearing on another international organization, whereas PRO 23 fell exclusively within the mandate of IHO.

Mr. OEI (Singapore) supported the proposal and agreed with the delegations of Germany, the United Kingdom and Australia that IHO was facing a crucial challenge. Timely action was vital, since the matter was now on the table for IMO. The credibility of IHO was at stake. A strong signal should be sent to IMO that IHO was prepared to take up the challenge.

Captain KAMPFER (South Africa) commended the DNV report. He supported the proposal and agreed with the remarks by the delegations of Australia, the United Kingdom, Germany and Singapore.

Admiral ABRAMOV (Russian Federation) supported the proposal. In spite of the connection between them, PRO 21 and PRO 23 should be discussed separately.

Commander KLEPSVIK (Norway) assured the delegation of Canada that the intention was to submit only the resolution to IMO, not the explanatory note. It should be borne in mind that when IMO discussed ECDIS carriage requirements at NAV 53 and NAV 54 it would need information on ENC coverage, and IHO or its representatives should be able to respond. It was important for IMO to know that it had the backing of IHO. The two proposals could be discussed separately, the second as an internal matter and the first as a signal to IMO.

The PRESIDENT assured the delegation of Canada that IMO had identified IHO as the body to which it referred for hydrographic advice, and that the proposed resolution expressed support for IMO.

IGA BESSERO (France) said PRO 21 and PRO 23 could be discussed separately, but it should be borne in mind that if the Conference rejected PRO 23, it would be difficult for IHO to commit itself vis-à-vis IMO on PRO 21. The two proposals must be handled in a consistent manner. Some States were not familiar with all the workings of IHO. It would be useful to take up the report of the WEND Committee before deciding on Proposals 21 and 23.

The PRESIDENT said that the inter-relationship between the two proposals called for further clarification. He suggested deferring further consideration of PRO 21 until the following session.

It was so agreed.

Rapporteur : Mr. Keith E. ALEXANDER (United States of America)

CONTENTS

Consideration of Proposals (Agenda item 3) (continued)

- PRO 12 - Establishment of a Working Group to revise the IHO Strategic Plan (Agenda item 3) (continued)
- PRO 19 - Establishment of a Working Group to study and propose a new edition of the IHB Staff Regulations (Agenda item 3) (continued)
- PRO 20 - Establishment of a Working Group on Hydrography and Cartography of Inland Waters (Agenda item 3) (continued)

Consideration of Reports (Agenda item 4)

- Programme 3 - Report of the Worldwide Electronic Navigational Chart Database (WEND) Committee (Agenda item 4 c)

Consideration of Proposals (Agenda item 3) (continued)

- PRO 23 - A Resolution on Electronic Navigational Chart Coverage, Availability, Consistency and Quality (Agenda item 3) (continued)
- PRO 21 - A Resolution on ENC Coverage in relation to ECDIS Carriage Requirements (Agenda item 3) (continued)
- PRO 22 - Establishment of a Working Group on Marine Spatial Data Infrastructure Development (Agenda item 3)
- PRO 24 - Resolution inviting Contracting Parties to consider the entry into force of the Protocol of Amendments to the Convention as a matter of priority (Agenda item 3)

Consideration of the Reports on Work Programme 2002–2007 (Agenda item 4)

- Programme 1 - Cooperation between Member States and with International Organization (Agenda item 4 a)
-

CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSALS (Agenda item 3) (continued)

PRO 12 - ESTABLISHMENT OF A WORKING GROUP TO REVISE THE IHO STRATEGIC PLAN (CONF.17/G02) (Agenda item 3) (continued)

The PRESIDENT, recalling that the election of the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the IHO Strategic Planning Working Group (SPWG) had been left pending from the previous day, opened the floor for nominations.

Commander LUSIANI (Italy) nominated IGA Gilles Bessero of France, as Chairman.

Rear Admiral MONCRIEFF (United Kingdom) nominated Captain Floor Haan of the Netherlands, as Chairman.

Rear Admiral DI VINCENZO (Argentina) nominated Captain (Retd.) Wesley Cavalheiro of Brazil, as Vice-Chairman.

The delegations of Algeria, Germany, Greece, Japan, Norway, Portugal, Russia and Tunisia seconded the nomination of IGA Bessero.

The delegations of China, Indonesia, Singapore and Venezuela seconded the nomination of Captain Haan.

The delegations of Norway, Portugal, Russia and Venezuela seconded the nomination of Captain Cavalheiro.

A vote was taken by show of hands, following which the PRESIDENT announced that IGA Bessero had been elected Chairman of the Working Group.

IGA Gilles Bessero of France was elected Chairman of the IHO Strategic Planning Working Group.

The PRESIDENT asked if there were any further nominations for the position of Vice-Chairman.

Commander LUSIANI (Italy) suggested that there should be two vice-chairmen. He nominated Captain (Retd.) Wesley Cavalheiro of Brazil, and Captain Floor Haan of the Netherlands.

The PRESIDENT asked whether the Conference agreed that the Working Group should have two vice-chairmen.

It was so agreed.

Captain (Retd.) Wesley Cavalheiro of Brazil, and Captain Floor Haan of the Netherlands, were elected by acclamation as Vice-Chairmen of the IHO Strategic Planning Working Group.

PRO 19 - ESTABLISHMENT OF A WORKING GROUP TO STUDY AND PROPOSE A NEW EDITION OF THE IHB STAFF REGULATIONS (CONF.17/G02) (Agenda item 3) (continued)

The PRESIDENT opened the floor for nominations for the chairman and vice-chairman of the Working Group tasked with preparing a new edition of the IHB Staff Regulations.

Dr. NARAYANAN (Canada) suggested that since the Working Group would be dealing with IHB staff issues, it should perhaps be chaired by the President of the IHB or another official from the Bureau.

The PRESIDENT asked whether the Conference wished to appoint the President of the IHB as Chairman of the Working Group, on the understanding that he would distance himself from any issues that concerned him personally.

Dr. EHLERS (Germany) said it would not be appropriate for the Working Group to be chaired by anyone from the IHB. It was important to avoid giving the impression that those affected by the Staff Regulations were steering the work of the Group. In the absence of nominations from the floor, his delegation would be willing to volunteer the services of Ms. Ingelore Hering of Germany.

Ms. Ingelore Hering of Germany, was elected by acclamation as Chairman of the Working Group mandated to study and propose a new edition of the IHB Staff Regulations.

The PRESIDENT called for nominations for Vice-Chairman of the Working Group.

Rear Admiral MONCRIEFF nominated Mr. Mike Hollin, Director of Human Resources for the United Kingdom Hydrographic Office, as Vice-Chairman.

Mr. Mike Hollin of the United Kingdom was elected by acclamation as Vice-Chairman of the Working Group mandated to study and propose a new edition of the IHB Staff Regulations.

The PRESIDENT said that the Conference had now concluded its consideration of Proposals 12 and 19.

**PRO 20 - ESTABLISHMENT OF A WORKING GROUP ON HYDROGRAPHY AND CARTOGRAPHY OF INLAND WATERS (CONF.17/G02 Add.1)
(Agenda item 3) (continued)**

The PRESIDENT drew attention to the revised version of PRO 20, submitted by Argentina and supported by Brazil, Ecuador, Peru, South Africa, Uruguay, the United States of America and Venezuela. The proposal, as amended by the drafting group formed the previous day, now read:

“A Working Group on Hydrography and Cartography of Inland Waters shall be set up by the CHRIS, which will determine its terms of reference and rules of procedure and will report on its work to the 4th Extraordinary International Hydrographic Conference in 2009.

“The purpose of the Working Group will be to analyze and recommend the level and nature of IHO involvement in the Hydrography and Cartography of Inland Waterways.

“The Working Group should involve all relevant non-IHO international bodies in its deliberations, including the Inland Electronic Charts Harmonization Group (IEHG)”.

The PRESIDENT invited comments on the proposal.

Dr. EHLERS (Germany) said his delegation fully supported PRO 20 as revised.

The PRESIDENT said that, in the absence of other comments, he took it that the Conference wished to adopt the proposal.

PRO 20, as amended, was adopted.

The PRESIDENT said that before taking up Proposals 21 and 23, he intended to ask the Chairman of the Worldwide Electronic Navigational Chart Database (WEND) Committee to present his report. That would provide a clear understanding of the Committee's work, which had a strong bearing on the two proposals.

CONSIDERATION OF REPORTS (Agenda item 4)

REPORT OF THE WORLDWIDE ELECTRONIC NAVIGATIONAL CHART DATABASE (WEND) COMMITTEE (Conf.17/WP.3) (Agenda item 4 c)

Captain KAMPFER (South Africa), Chairman of the WEND Committee, said the purpose of WEND was to ensure a worldwide consistent level of high-quality, updated official electronic navigation charts (ENCs) through integrated services in support of the chart carriage requirements of Chapter V of the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea (SOLAS) and the requirements of IMO's performance standards for electronic chart display and information systems (ECDIS). Turning to the WEND Committee report, he said the Committee had held four meetings since the XVIth International Hydrographic Conference. Discussions at those meetings had focused on ways to increase ENC coverage and availability and on mechanisms for efficient ENC distribution and use. Key outcomes included a study on ENC coverage in 2002 and 2003, which had led to the development of a worldwide ENC coverage catalogue, available on the IHO website, and the setting up in 2003 of a WEND Task Group to promote worldwide ENC coverage and updating, uniform data quality and user-friendly and integrated ENC services. The WEND Task Group had been charged, inter alia, with developing a study to identify the main shipping routes for all SOLAS vessels, including high-speed craft, and to identify gaps in ENC coverage.

The WEND Committee interacted with various other organizations and groups, including Regional Hydrographic Commissions, from which it received reports on ENC scheming, production and availability. The contribution of RHCs was considered essential to the achievement of global ENC coverage. The Committee also cooperated with Regional ENC Coordinating Centres (RENCs).

Among the major outstanding issues to be addressed in the future were inadequate ENC coverage, ENC pricing and inconsistencies in ENC data. Inadequate ENC coverage was a strong disincentive to navigation with ECDIS. In December 2006, IMO Maritime Safety Committee (MSC) had adopted revisions to the High-Speed Craft Code, making the carriage of ECDIS compulsory for new-built craft from 1 July 2008 and for existing craft from 1 July 2010. Hydrographic offices, IHO and IMO must therefore redouble their efforts to achieve adequate coverage of ENCs. As for ENC pricing, innovative solutions were needed to reduce the cost of ENCs to mariners. Finally, IHO should continue its efforts to resolve inconsistencies between adjoining ENC cells.

The PRESIDENT opened the floor for comments on the WEND Committee report.

Mr. ROBINSON (United Kingdom) said the United Kingdom Hydrographic Office wholeheartedly supported and adhered to the WEND principles. He strongly urged other IHO Member States to do likewise. However, in his view, insufficient progress had been made in the past 15 years in implementing the Principles. The improvements in coverage were encouraging, but there would be continued resistance to the adoption of ENCs by mariners while coverage along major routes and in major ports remained incomplete. Issues of cost and consistency were also preventing the adoption of ENCs. The UKHO had recently been considering a number of initiatives to address the issues of coverage, cost and consistency. Good progress had been achieved with regard to coverage and cost, but in the area of consistency, finding a common solution was proving more difficult, for three main reasons. Firstly, ENC standards left much scope for discretion; secondly, the majority of the world's ENCs had been produced from paper charts; and thirdly, the scale of the task to be accomplished was enormous: the world was a very large place.

Captain IBARRA (Chile) was in general agreement with those views, although he felt the work of the Committee had been good and timely.

Commander KLEPSVIK (Norway) said he did not agree that the level of ENC coverage was disappointing. The task of converting from paper to digital charts was enormously complex and highly costly, and called for many new competencies, which it had taken time to develop. The increases in ENC coverage from 2000 onwards reflected many years of effort around the world to standardize ENC production and to harmonize validation through RENCs. He quite agreed that consistency issues had to be addressed. All available instruments, in particular RENCs, should be brought to bear for that purpose.

Mr. OEI (Singapore) agreed with the comments by the representative of the United Kingdom regarding cost, consistency and coverage. The issue of consistency was of great concern in his region. The East Asia Hydrographic Commission (EAHC), which he chaired, had devoted three meetings in 2005 and 2006 to ENC harmonization. Concerted international action was needed to address both coverage and consistency issues. He urged Member States, and especially regional and interregional commissions, to work together to that end.

Dr. NARAYANAN (Canada) said her country strongly supported the goal of ensuring consistent, high-quality ENCs around the world. Significant headway had been made towards that goal in the past decade, and in her view there was no reason to be overly concerned about slow progress. Some countries had admittedly progressed more rapidly than others, but it had to be recognized that not all countries were equally prepared to embrace electronic technology. IHO, through the RENCs, had a major role to play in building capacity in such countries.

The PRESIDENT invited the Conference to turn its attention to PRO 23, which dealt with many of the issues and concerns raised by delegates with respect to the report of the WEND Committee.

PRO 23 - A RESOLUTION ON ELECTRONIC NAVIGATIONAL CHART COVERAGE, AVAILABILITY, CONSISTENCY AND QUALITY (CONF.17/G02 Add.3) (Agenda item 3) (continued)

Dr. NISHIDA (Japan) introduced the proposal, which in his view did not conflict in any way with PRO 21.

The PRESIDENT invited the Conference to comment on the proposal.

Commander KLEPSVIK (Norway) agreed that PRO 23 did not contradict PRO 21. He also agreed that effort was needed to extend ENC coverage. However, he did not believe the resolution should note “with concern” that considerable efforts were still needed to satisfy the ENC coverage needed for mandatory ECDIS carriage. Although everyone recognized that much remained to be done, it was necessary to be aware of what Member States had done within their capabilities. He proposed the deletion of the words “with concern”.

IGA BESSERO (France) said France fully supported the proposal, and especially the setting of a specific target for coverage by 2010. However, he felt some amendments were called for in the conclusion. The reference to “the IHO and Member States” was confusing, because IHO was nothing more than the sum of its Member States. In addition, the importance of the role of RHCs, referred to in the preamble part of the resolution should also be reflected in the conclusion. He suggested amending the conclusion to read “Member States should adhere and comply with the WEND Principles in order for the IHO, through its Member States and the regional and worldwide bodies through which they come together, to achieve adequate coverage, availability, consistency and quality of ENCs by 2010”.

Mr. HECHT (Germany) supported the amendments proposed by the delegations of Norway and France. His delegation believed that ensuring ENC coverage was a prerequisite for ECDIS carriage, and PRO 23 was therefore fully in line with PRO 21. Although considerable progress had been achieved in regard to coverage, the IHO and its Member States must not become complacent. They must continue their efforts through both regional and interregional cooperation, to achieve better coverage and also to improve consistency. Collaborative effort was essential. Countries had to work together to ensure coverage and consistency. It should be noted that the resolution in PRO 23 would have implications for the IHO Work Programme, which the Conference would be discussing later.

Captain KAMPFER (South Africa) supported the amendments proposed by the delegations of Norway and France, and endorsed the comments by the representative of Germany.

Captain (Retd.) CAVALHEIRO (Brazil), supported by Commodore EL-BANNAN (Egypt), suggested that, since there were only two years between 2010 and the date of the next ordinary Conference, the target date in the concluding part of the proposal should be changed to 2012, that would give time to analyse the outcomes of the proposal. The Extraordinary Conference in 2009 could produce an evaluative report, and the 2012 Conference might make some corrections.

Captain BARNUM (United States of America) supported the proposal and the amendments by Norway and France. The target date should remain 2010. The Organization should set itself a deadline and stick to it.

Rear Admiral MONCRIEFF (United Kingdom) pointed out that IMO had not yet considered making carriage of ECDIS mandatory by 2010, so the preamble should not refer to that date. He applauded the intention of setting a firm deadline for implementation, since the ENC endeavour had been pending for too long. The proposal should not state that IMO had fixed upon 2010, but should make clear that IHO was going to deliver adequate coverage, availability, consistency and quality of ENCs by that date.

He also suggested that in the concluding part of the proposal, “the IHO and Member States” could be shortened to “Member States”.

Mr. SAHEB-ETTABA (Canada) supported the proposal and agreed with the remarks by the representative of the United Kingdom and the amendments proposed by Norway and France. In the concluding part of the proposal, the words “and Member States” could be omitted, since the Organization could only work through its Member States.

Dr. EHLERS (Germany) said that although assistance from IHO in its key consultative role would be very welcome, it was the responsibility of the Member States themselves to ensure adequate coverage, availability, consistency and quality of ENCs.

He did not object to deleting the date of 2010 from the preamble.

IGA BESSERO (France), supported by Captain SOBOLEV (Russian Federation), said it was important for the proposal to make clear that a collective effort was involved by individual Member States, coordinated centrally. The reference to IHO should be retained. He repeated the amendment he had proposed earlier.

Mr. SAHEB-ETTABA (Canada) said that in the interest of making progress he withdrew the proposal to delete “and Member States”. The amendment proposed by France was acceptable.

Captain NAIRN (Australia) said that by adopting the proposal Member States would be putting pressure on themselves to maintain a target by which IMO could consider mandatory carriage of ECDIS as a contribution to navigation safety. Member States should, however, be aware that the WEND principles, to which the proposal urged them to adhere, also included an obligation on the part

of Member States to distribute their ENC's among themselves, and to urge entities over which they had no control, namely the added-value resellers, to make the data readily accessible to all users.

At the present early stage of seeking to have authorized ENC's adopted by the maritime community, hydrographic offices should strive to keep costs and pricing as low as possible, to ensure wide availability and uptake.

Captain IBARRA (Chile) welcomed the view expressed by the representative of Australia that Member States should deliberately put themselves under pressure to achieve the goal stated in the proposal.

Rear Admiral RAO (India) suggested replacing "Member States should adhere" by "Member States need to adhere" in order to reflect the fact that the role of IHO was consultative rather than mandatory.

Dr. EHLERS (Germany) said that in international usage "should" did not betoken an obligation, but rather a strong encouragement to do something.

Rear Admiral RAO (India) withdrew his proposed amendment.

The PRESIDENT summarized the proposed amendments. The Conference was apparently in agreement to remove the reference to 2010 from the introductory paragraph.

It was so agreed

The PRESIDENT noted the proposal by Norway to omit the words "with concern".

Captain de HAAN (Netherlands), supported by Rear Admiral MONCRIEFF (United Kingdom), said the entire proposal expressed concern. The words ought to be retained.

Captain KLEPSVIK (Norway) felt that the focus was not on concern, but on IHO's determination to attach importance to ENC coverage.

The PRESIDENT suggested that since very few delegations wished to retain the phrase "with concern", it could perhaps be deleted.

It was so agreed

The PRESIDENT noted that in the concluding part of the proposal, the delegation of France had suggested replacing the phrase "in order for the IHO and Member States to achieve....." by "in order for the IHO, through its Member States and the regional and worldwide bodies in which they come together, to achieve" He understood that there was a wide measure of support for that suggestion.

It was so agreed

The PRESIDENT drew attention to the final amendment from Brazil, extending the target date from 2010 to 2012. In the absence of widespread support for that amendment, the Conference apparently preferred to retain the original date.

It was so agreed

Proposal 23, as amended, was adopted.

PRO 21 - A RESOLUTION ON ENC COVERAGE IN RELATION TO ECDIS CARRIAGE REQUIREMENTS (CONF.17/G02 Add.1) (Agenda item 3) (continued)

The PRESIDENT suggested that the Conference, having just reminded itself of the importance of high-quality ENCs and the WEND Principles, might be in a frame of mind to commit itself strongly to supporting IMO's efforts to introduce mandatory carriage requirements for ECDIS.

Mr. SAHEB-ETTABA (Canada) suggested that PRO 21 should make some reference to PRO 23.

The PRESIDENT suggested that such a reference could be included in the preamble.

Captain KLEPSVIK (Norway) said that his delegation could accept that solution.

It was so agreed

Proposal 21, as amended, was adopted.

PRO 22 - ESTABLISHMENT OF A WORKING GROUP ON MARINE SPATIAL DATA INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT (CONF.17/G02 Add.2) (Agenda item 3) (continued)

Dr. EHLERS (Germany) introduced the proposal and said that the question of spatial data infrastructures was one of the future challenges for the IHO. In the past, the Organization had focused almost exclusively on safety of navigation, but it was now felt that hydrographic services would be given wider and more varied responsibilities. The same idea was found in the preamble to the Protocol of Amendments to the Convention and in the description of the Organization's future objectives.

A variety of activities in the maritime sphere depended on having a sufficiency of data. Many data were hidden in databases of one kind or another or by different organizations, or even by marine science. The increasingly important task of making data relevant to the marine sphere available for a range of different purposes would require a spatial data infrastructure on the national level, as well as close cooperation on an international level.

In November 2005, an international seminar on the question had concluded that IHO should make it one of its key issues for the future. To that end, it was proposed to set up a working group to consider the extent to which the hydrographic community should provide input for national spatial data infrastructures.

The PRESIDENT OF THE DIRECTING COMMITTEE gave a brief overview of IHO activities to date in that area. The effective implementation of an infrastructure for spatial information called for coordination among all stakeholders. IHO and its Member States had a significant role to play. In November 2005 there had been an initial seminar in Rostock, Germany, organized jointly by the German Hydrographic Service and IHO, dealing with the role of hydrographic services in connection with geospatial data planning and infrastructure. The seminar had concluded that CHRIS was the appropriate body within IHO to consider and advise on the question. Further information about the seminar had been sent to Member States in a Circular Letter. In February 2006 an IHO follow-up workshop had been held in Cuba, and information about it had likewise been transmitted in a Circular Letter.

IHO had also co-sponsored a conference in Dublin, Ireland, under the title "Land and marine information integration", exploring ways of integrating European land and marine data sets. IHO was involved in the INSPIRE initiative, which was based on infrastructures for spatial information established and operated by the European Union Member States. IHO also cooperated with other

relevant bodies and initiatives. The IHB remained in close contact with CHRIS, and Member States would be kept informed of progress.

Rear Admiral ANDREASEN (United States of America) emphasized the significance of the proposal. Many issues relating to the interface between hydrographic and topographic data had to be resolved. There were many complications in the coastal zone owing to the impact of tides. He fully endorsed the proposal by Germany.

Dr. YEON (Republic of Korea) described some of the work done in that area of his country. He fully supported the proposal.

Mr. JARMBÆK (Denmark) also strongly supported the proposal. The European Union had recently enacted a directive establishing a legal framework for a spatial data infrastructure, with hydrography as one of the main data sets. It was a matter of priority for IHO to engage with the subject.

Captain WARD (Australia), speaking as the Chairman of CHRIS, noted that spatial data infrastructures were developing fast. IHO should decide what role it would have. The proposal would have the effect of informing IHO and Member States how they could best contribute to spatial data infrastructures. CHRIS, being the most appropriate committee to coordinate the work in that area, stood ready to establish the proposed working group and to set its terms of reference in the light of those drafted in the annex to the proposal.

Commander KLEPSVIK (Norway) said he fully supported the proposal. It was very important for hydrographic offices to define their role in national spatial data initiatives, and also for IHO to be involved in activities such as standardization. Norway was eager to participate in the working group.

Colonel ALUM ORTIZ (Cuba) said it was a very good idea to form a working group on the issue, because many countries were already working individually on it. It was essential to consider how the data could be shared. That brought in issues of legality, copyright, and compatibility. He supported the proposal, and especially the suggestions by the representative of Australia.

Dr. NISHIDA (Japan) asked whether it was intended to set up the working group under CHRIS.

The PRESIDENT explained that that had been proposed by Australia in the form of an amendment.

Dr. NARAYANAN (Canada) expressed her full support for the proposal. She welcomed the reference to liaison with other relevant technical bodies. For example, the IOC's International Oceanographic Data Exchange Committee (IODE) had much to offer in terms of experience and lessons learned. CHRIS could be asked to establish the working group and set its terms of reference. The Chairman of CHRIS should work closely with the IODE Chairman. Her delegation was willing to participate in the working group.

IGA BESSERO (France) supported the proposal. He was also in favour of setting up the working group within CHRIS, but warned that a proliferation of ideas might result in the fragmentation of efforts.

Rear Admiral MONCRIEFF (United Kingdom), speaking as a co-sponsor of the proposal, said that as a consequence of emerging European legislation, European hydrographic offices were having to move beyond their traditional use of data for navigational purposes, and become acquisition centres for data used in other ways and of interest to other bodies. Hydrographic offices elsewhere were likely to be similarly affected. They should not however lose sight of their core functions. He agreed with the delegation of Australia that CHRIS was the appropriate forum for the working group, not least on account of its work on data formats. Information gathered by Norway Digital could usefully be shared by means of the working group. The matter should be a regular item on the agendas of the Regional Hydrographic Commissions.

Mr. SPITTAL (New Zealand) expressed his support for a working group. Its terms of reference could be extended to include the development of a hydrographic meta-data standard.

Mr. ESTERI (Islamic Republic of Iran) fully supported the idea of a working group within CHRIS.

The PRESIDENT read out the text of PRO 22 with the amendment proposed by Australia, as follows:

“The Conference is requested to ask the CHRIS to establish a working group on the Hydrographic Community inputs to National Spatial Data Infrastructures (NSDI) and to set its terms of reference and rules of procedure, noting the guidelines in the Annex to this Proposal.”

Captain WARD (Australia), speaking as Chairman of CHRIS, asked whether the Conference wished to set a reporting deadline for the CHRIS. If so, should the deadline be the Extraordinary International Hydrographic Conference in 2009?

Mr. SPITTAL (New Zealand) asked whether his suggestion of extending the terms of reference of the working group had been taken into account.

The PRESIDENT said it was his understanding that CHRIS would do so when setting the terms of reference for the working group.

Captain WARD (Australia), speaking as Chairman of CHRIS, confirmed that understanding. CHRIS had guidance implicating IHO S-100, and that would give rise to work on meta-data standards.

The PRESIDENT noted that the delegations of Germany and the United Kingdom both agreed with the proposal that CHRIS should report on its work to the 4th Extraordinary International Hydrographic Conference. An addition to that effect might read “and to report on its work to the 4th Extraordinary International Hydrographic Conference in 2009”.

If he heard no objection he would take it that the Conference wished to accept the amendment.

It was so agreed.

PRO 22, as amended, was adopted.

PRO 24 - RESOLUTION INVITING CONTRACTING PARTIES TO CONSIDER THE ENTRY INTO FORCE OF THE PROTOCOL OF AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION AS A MATTER OF PRIORITY (CONF.17/G02 Add.4) (Agenda item 3) (continued)

Professor EHLERS (Germany) said it was evident from remarks made at the first plenary session that only 13 Contracting Parties had approved the Protocol of Amendments to the Convention. Admittedly, the procedures involved were often lengthy, but he had the impression that some governments were oblivious to the importance of hydrography and the need to modernize an organization such as the IHO, and were failing to give due priority to the subject. With a view to raising awareness, the Conference should again encourage Contracting Parties to take all necessary steps to speed up the process of approval. It should request the IHB to approach the Contracting Parties and invite them to consider the entry into force of the Protocol as a matter of priority.

Dr. YEON (Republic of Korea) fully supported the proposal. His country had ratified the Protocol of Amendments in 2006.

Commander KLEPSVIK (Norway) suggested deleting the words “with concern”.

Mr. SAHEB ETTABA (Canada) said that for the sake of consistency with other IHO documents, the word “modernization” should be replaced by “implementation of the modernized structure”, “Contracting Parties” should be replaced with “Member States”, and “the President of the IHB Directing Committee” should be amended to “the President of the IHB”.

Professor EHLERS (Germany) said the expression “modernization of the IHO” had been intentionally chosen to refer to the complete modernization of the Organization, including its objectives, not merely a modernized structure. The term “Contracting Parties” had likewise been chosen for legal reasons, being the term used in the Convention.

Mr. SAHEB ETTABA (Canada) withdrew the two amendments.

IGA BESSERO (France), supported by the delegation of Germany, said that “the President of the Directing Committee” was the standard term. “The President of the IHB” would be incorrect. As an alternative, “IHB” could stand on its own.

Mr. SAHEB ETTABA (Canada) said either term would be acceptable.

The PRESIDENT opted for “President of the Directing Committee”.

PRO 24, as amended, was adopted.

CONSIDERATION OF THE REPORTS ON THE WORK PROGRAMME 2002-2007 (Agenda item 4 a)

PROGRAMME No. 1 - COOPERATION BETWEEN MEMBER STATES AND WITH INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS (CONF.1/WP.1)

COOPERATION BETWEEN MEMBER STATES

The PRESIDENT invited the Conference to consider the reports, conclusions and proposals of the Regional Hydrographic Commissions, contained in document CONF.17/WP.1.

REPORTS OF THE IHO REGIONAL HYDROGRAPHIC COMMISSIONS

Nordic Hydrographic Commission (NHC)

Mr. ESKILDSEN (Denmark) said he had nothing to add to the report. He suggested that the Conference take note of it.

The Conference took note of the report.

North Sea Hydrographic Commission (NSHC)

The PRESIDENT, speaking as the previous Chairman of the NSHC, noted that Ireland had received sufficient votes to join the IHO. He hoped it would deposit its instrument of accession shortly. He drew particular attention to NSHC Conclusion 81 (2006) by which the NSHC had resolved to establish a working group on EU marine and maritime policies in order to monitor their impact on Hydrographic Offices.

The Conference took note of the report.

East Asia Hydrographic Commission (EAHC)

Mr. PARRY (Singapore), Chairman of the Commission, presented the report, highlighting some of the significant events during the period. The South China Sea (SCS) ENC had been released in March 2005, and a task group was looking into harmonization of small-scale ENCs with medium and large-scale ENCs. The first coordinating meeting on capacity building had been held in January 2007. An assessment of navigational hazards in the South China Sea would be presented to the Commission in January 2008. Proposals for capacity building support had been submitted to IHO, and he hoped it would be obtained so that work could proceed on ENC quality assurance.

Captain GORZIGLIA (Director, IHB), speaking in his capacity as Chairman of the Capacity Building Committee, said that a comprehensive proposal had been received from the EAHC and would be discussed in full at the Committee's next meeting. The proposal had been submitted in an exemplary manner, which could serve as a model for other Regional Hydrographic Commissions.

The Conference took note of the report.

United States-Canada Hydrographic Commission (USCHC)

Captain BARNUM (United States of America), Co-Chairman of the Commission, presented the report. The next United States Hydrographic Conference would be held in Norfolk, Virginia, in a week's time, and the Canadian Hydrographic Conference for 2008 would be held in Victoria, British Columbia.

The Conference took note of the report.

Mediterranean and Black Seas Hydrographic Commission (MBSHC)

Captain QUIRÓS (Spain), Chairman of the Commission, reporting on developments since the preparation of the report, said that a proposed amendment to the Commission's Statutes to enable associate States to host meetings of the Commission had been accepted by a majority of the members and would, he hoped, be ratified shortly. Malta would then host the next meeting of the Commission, in October 2007. The closure of the International Maritime Academy (IMA) was highly regrettable and would be discussed at the next meeting of the Regional Commission. The Commission on Promulgation of Radio Navigational Warnings (CPNRW) was planning to create a sub-area in the Black Sea to improve the dissemination of maritime safety information. Turkey had volunteered to coordinate the sub-area. It would give a detailed presentation of the resources available and an action plan to the 9th meeting of the CPRNW in Monaco in September 2007.

The Conference took note of the report.

Baltic Sea Hydrographic Commission (BSHC)

Mr. KRASTINS (Latvia), Chairman of the Commission, introducing the report, drew particular attention to the excellent cooperation under the HELCOM project in the BSHC region.

The Conference took note of the report.

Eastern Atlantic Hydrographic Commission (EAHC)

IGA BESSERO (France), speaking on behalf of the Chairman of the Commission, introduced the report with the aid of overhead slides. There were 24 countries in the region, but only six were IHO Member States. The survey status in Africa was generally inadequate, and communication unreliable. Progress made during the reporting period on INT and ENC coverage should not obscure the fact that resurveying was required in some zones. There was a considerable need for training, equipment and

assistance in order to rectify the imbalance in hydrographic capabilities between North and South. The zone had served as a ‘laboratory’ for the development of capacity building methods. Work had been undertaken at the political level among non-member States of IHO to raise awareness of the need to develop hydrographic capacities and to promote the establishment of national hydrographic committees. The Statutes of the Commission had been amended to enable associate members to take a more active part in the Commission and to host conferences, and the 9th meeting of the Commission had been hosted by Senegal. That meeting had approved the ENC small-scale scheme, and had adopted the principle that the results of third party surveys should be transmitted to the regional charting authorities. The way ahead lay in enhancing survey cooperation within the region and beyond; developing bilateral State-to-State agreements to meet SOLAS requirements; and launching a project to develop electronic maritime highways. He called upon all Member States which had not already done so to approve the applications by Cameroon and Sierra Leone to accede to IHO.

Captain BARRITT (United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of the United Kingdom and as Vice-Chairman of the Capacity Building Committee, strongly endorsed the report. Under the capable leadership of France, many of the Organization’s capacity building tools had been tested, and prototypes had been deployed in the Commission area, and he commended the models to other regions. The question was: What comes next? Every potential Member State would lend its own impetus, and new members must play a proactive role.

The Conference took note of the report.

	—————	CONF.17/P/SR.6
SIXTH PLENARY SESSION	9 May 2007	1405-1745

—————

Rapporteur : Mr. Steven DEBRECHT (United States of America)

CONTENTS

Consideration of the Reports on the Work Programme 2002–2007 (Agenda item 4) (continued)

- Programme 1 Cooperation between Member States and with International Organizations (continued)
- Programme 2 Capacity building and Technical Cooperation
- Programme 3 Techniques and Standards Support

—————

**CONSIDERATION OF THE REPORTS ON THE WORK PROGRAMME 2002–2007
(Agenda item 4 a) (continued)**

**PROGRAMME No. 1 COOPERATION BETWEEN MEMBER STATES AND WITH
INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS (CONF.17/WP.1)
(continued)**

REPORTS OF THE IHO REGIONAL HYDROGRAPHIC COMMISSIONS (continued)

South East Pacific Hydrographic Commission

Commander PROAÑO SILVA (Ecuador), speaking as Chairman of the South East Pacific Hydrographic Commission (SEPHC), presented the report and provided some additional information on the activities of the Commission. During the reporting period he had also chaired the hydrographic committee of the Instituto Panamericano de Geografía e Historia (IGPH), which had cooperated in producing a Spanish version of a hydrographic manual. The translation, kindly undertaken by the Venezuelan Hydrographic Office, had been reviewed by the Chile Hydrographic Office, and a digital version had been produced and distributed. A Spanish version of a United States manual on surveying was currently in production; the translation was being supervised by the Ecuador Hydrographic Office. A workshop on river surveying would be held in November 2007 in Iquitos organized by the Peru Hydrographic Office under the auspices of IHO. SEPHC wished to acknowledge the support received from IHO's CBC and from Member States in setting up a regional working group on bathymetric studies and in editing bathymetric charts.

The Conference took note of the report.

South West Pacific Hydrographic Commission

Mr. SPITTAL (New Zealand), Chairman of the Commission (SWPHC), presented the report. It was encouraging that seven of the eight SWPHC member countries, including Papua New Guinea and Tonga, were represented at the Conference. He drew attention to the progress made in producing ENCs, which had continued since the preparation of the report, and in establishing an infrastructure in Papua New Guinea for circulating navigational aids. The Commission looked forward to collaborating with Solomon Islands, an associate member, which was soon to re-establish its hydrographic office. A lack of skills and technical resources hampered the work of hydrographic offices in some countries of the region, and strategies were needed to overcome those problems. There was considerable hydrographic activity in the SWPHC area, and vessels of various scientific and tourist organizations were collecting survey data. SWPHC was taking steps to coordinate and make available the data now being collected, and to promote the optimum use of the vessels and equipment available. IHB had signed a Memorandum of Understanding with SOPAC, and the Commission was also collaborating within its zone with the Pacific Island Maritime Administration and with IMO. It was trying to raise the profile of hydrography in IMO meetings. The Commission had participated in a meeting of Pacific Island Ministers of Transport, and that had been a further opportunity to raise awareness of hydrography. Efforts were also being made to include hydrographers in national marine coordination committees, and to publicize the training, scholarship and other opportunities available.

The Conference took note of the report.

Mesoamerican–Caribbean Sea Hydrographic Commission

Captain GONGORA (Mexico), speaking on behalf of the Chairmen of the Mesoamerican–Caribbean Sea Hydrographic Commission (MACHC), introduced the report. During the reporting period, the Statutes of the Commission had been amended to enable El Salvador and Brazil to join, and the Commission had been renamed to reflect the expansion of the area it covered. A capacity building committee had been established. The Commission's next meeting would take place in October 2007 in Brazil.

Captain BARRITT (United Kingdom), speaking as Vice-Chairman of the CBC, said that the membership of MACHC, like that of SWPHC, included small island developing countries facing special challenges. Those countries were not represented at the Conference, so he urged the delegations from larger mainland countries to ensure that their smaller neighbours were not forgotten. It was vital to maintain support for them through regional capacity building, and especially to sustain the progress so far made in meeting SOLAS V hydrographic requirements.

The Conference took note of the report.

Southern Africa and Islands Hydrographic Commission

Captain KAMPFER, speaking as Chairman of the Southern Africa and Islands Hydrographic Commission (SAIHC), introduced the report. Additional activities by the Commission in the second half of 2006 had included technical visits to a number of countries in the region, organized by the IHO Capacity Building Committee. Such visits were a valuable opportunity to raise awareness of hydrography among national decision-makers at a high level. The recommendations arising from the visits had led to the formulation of a SAIHC capacity building management plan, which would form the basis of future capacity building activities.

The Conference took note of the report.

ROPME Sea Area Hydrographic Commission

Commander HUSSAIN (Pakistan) speaking on behalf of the Chairman of the ROPME Sea Area Hydrographic Commission (RSHAC), presented the report.

RSAHC planned to hold its next meeting in Karachi in the first half of 2008, to include a meeting of Navarea IX coordinators and a workshop on ENC's. RSAHC was working with Saudi Arabia to exchange expertise in hydrography and ENC's, with a view to enhancing regional cooperation.

The Conference took note of the report.

North Indian Ocean Hydrographic Commission

Rear Admiral MONCRIEFF (United Kingdom), speaking as Chairman of the North Indian Ocean Hydrographic Commission (NIOHC), drew attention to the progress achieved in INT charting, the development of ENC's (50% complete) and capacity building. The Commission had decided to establish a mixed team from Member States in the region, using the United States "concept of operations" (CONOPS) approach, to carry out survey work around the Seychelles in 2008. The results of that exercise would provide the basis for setting up a rapid assessment team to respond to future disasters. Lessons were being learned from the activities following the 2004 tsunami, and lines of communication would be tested. Saudi Arabia had joined the Commission.

The Conference took note of the report.

Hydrographic Committee on Antarctica

Captain GORZIGLIA (Director, IHB), speaking as Chairman of the Hydrographic Committee on Antarctica (HCA), expressed his appreciation to the Member States that had hosted the four meetings held during the reporting period, and also to Argentina, which would host the Commission's seventh meeting in October 2007. He drew attention to the progress made in INT chart production. Of the 98 charts in the cartographic scheme for Region M, 54 had now been published, but hydrographic data for the remaining charts were insufficient. The Commission had accordingly set up a hydrographic survey working group to provide guidance for the gathering and submission of data, to evaluate additional charts and to draw up a list of high-priority surveys. The Commission was taking steps to incorporate S-59 data into the S-55 database, and Member States were requested to supply updated information for the review of S-55. All Member States should be encouraged to increase their hydrographic activity in Antarctica. HCA was collaborating with IMO, and had expressed its concern about the applicability of SOLAS V in Antarctica, and especially the provision of hydrographic services. HCA was also collaborating with IOC in relation to the GEBCO programme and the International Bathymetric Chart of the Southern Ocean, and with the Antarctic Treaty System, the Council of Managers of National Antarctica Programmes (COMNAP) and the International

Association of Antarctic Tour Operators (IAATO). Agreement had been reached with IAATO to place hydrographic surveyors on IAATO ships.

Rear Admiral MONCRIEFF (United Kingdom) expressed concern at the expansion of tourism in Antarctica, which was resulting in a growing number of thin-hulled tourist vessels entering remote, poorly surveyed waters far from any assistance and without any search and rescue cover. IHO should take advantage of the opportunities provided by International Polar Year 2007-2008 to redouble its efforts to ensure that vessels entering the region were better prepared.

Rear Admiral RAO (India) informed the Conference that India had requested support from the United Kingdom to permit it to complete its Antarctic hydrographic obligations in the near future.

Captain BARRITT (United Kingdom), speaking as Vice-Chairman of the Capacity Building Committee, welcomed the bilateral cooperative agreements covering the area. The joint Argentina-Chile programme, for example, should make a valuable long-term contribution to hydrography in the area. Other Member States should follow suit and confirm their contributions to the HCA prioritized survey plan. It was disappointing to learn from the editorial in the April 2007 issue of *Hydro International* that the information available on the Internet about International Polar Year 2007-2008 omitted all reference to hydrography. No offers had yet been received in response to IHO Circular Letter 15, which had alerted all Member States to the fact that the CBC would respond favourably to countries willing to second hydrography staff or supply survey equipment for deployment on vessels entering Antarctic waters. Member States were urged to play their part in surveying the area.

The Conference took note of the report.

REPORTS OF THE COOPERATION WITH INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Cooperation with the United Nations

Rear Admiral BARBOR (Director, IHB), introducing the report, said that IHO had strengthened its relations with the United Nations over the reporting period and had improved its visibility as an organization with competence relating to the Convention on the Law of the Sea. IHO had participated in the 2002 World Summit on Sustainable Development, the General Assembly of the United Nations held in 2002 to mark the twentieth anniversary of the Convention on the Law of the Sea, and the Meeting on the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States in 2005. Its active participation in the United Nations Informal Consultative Process on Oceans and the Law of the Sea had resulted in the General Assembly recognizing the importance of hydrography, the role of IHO in enhancing the safety of navigation and hydrographic capacity building in developing countries, and in the designation of 21 June as World Hydrography Day. The United Nations Division of Oceans and the Law of the Sea was expected to request IHO to cooperate in the development of technical specifications for including maritime boundary delimitations in GIS systems and ENCs. IHO also gave reports on its activities to meetings of the United Nations Group of Experts on Geographical Names.

Dr. NARAYANAN (Canada) welcomed the designation of World Hydrography Day, which in 2006 had proved highly successful in Canada in raising awareness of hydrography among professionals and the general public. Notice should be given two years in advance of the theme for the day, so as to ensure successful planning.

Rear Admiral BARBOR (Director, IHB) undertook that IHO would set the timetable well in advance.

The Conference took note of the report.

Cooperation with the International Maritime Organization (IMO)

The PRESIDENT OF THE DIRECTING COMMITTEE said that IHO enjoyed very fruitful cooperation with IMO. The highlights included the adoption of IMO resolution A.958(23) on the Provision of Hydrographic Services; the issue by the IMO Maritime Safety Committee (MSC) of MSC/Circ.1179, on deficiencies in hydrographic surveying and nautical charting worldwide and their impact on safety of navigation and protection of the marine environment; the implementation of the IMO Voluntary Member State Audit Scheme; the preparation of guidelines for voyage planning for passenger ships operating in remote areas; the evaluation of the use of ECDIS and ENC development and consideration of mandatory carriage requirements for ECDIS; the revision of the ECDIS Performance Standards and the revision of SN/Circ.207 on the differences between RCDS and ECDIS; the development of an IHO online catalogue of available ENCs, RNCs and paper charts; consideration of “E-navigation”; the establishment of a joint IMO/IHO/WMO Correspondence Group to consider the provision of MSI services in Arctic waters, noting special thanks to Mr. Peter Doherty for coordinating; and participation by the IMO Secretariat in efforts by the IHO Capacity Building Work Programme to encourage the development of hydrography and safety of navigation in developing States. He added that all relevant information was posted on the IHO website.

The Conference took note of the report.

Cooperation with the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC)

Captain GORZIGLIA (Director, IHB) said that the 2000 Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) had been reviewed at a coordination meeting in 2002 and found to be satisfactory. Cooperation between the two organizations had focused mainly on ocean mapping projects, the Advisory Board on the Law of the Sea (ABLOS), the Global Sea Level Observing System (GLOSS), capacity building and tsunami preparedness. In 2005, economic constraints at UNESCO had resulted in a reduction of the IOC budget and a proposal to abolish IOC’s ocean mapping programme. Following expressions of concern from the hydrographic community, the programme had been retained with a small budget, but it should be borne in mind that if it were to be abolished, IHO would be the only remaining international body with competence in the field.

The Conference took note of the report.

Cooperation with the International Association of Marine Aids to Navigation and Lighthouse Authorities (IALA)

The PRESIDENT OF THE DIRECTING COMMITTEE said that the fruitful cooperation between the two organizations included IHO participation in the establishment of an information service on electronic aids to navigation; participation in meetings; cooperation in providing expert advice to the East African community in support of an IMO initiative to improve safety of navigation on Lake Victoria; IHO and IALA cooperation with IMO to identify the needs of States affected by the Indian Ocean tsunami disaster; and support in meeting hydrographic and navigational needs.

The Conference took note of the report.

Cooperation with the International Cartographic Association (ICA)

The PRESIDENT OF THE DIRECTING COMMITTEE, introducing the report, drew attention in particular to IHO’s highly constructive cooperation with ICA through participation in the biennial ICA conferences at which an ICA exhibition was held, together with an IHO navigational chart exhibition at which Member States were able to display their cartographic products. A prize was awarded for the best display. IHO also cooperated very closely with ICA in the Joint Board of Geospatial Information Societies and the IHO-FIG-ICA Advisory Board on the Standards of Competence for Hydrographic Surveyors and Nautical Cartographers.

The Conference took note of the report.

Cooperation with the International Organization for Standardization (ISO)

Rear Admiral BARBOR (Director, IHB), introducing the report, said that there had been close liaison with ISO through its Technical Committee TC211. IHO had contributed to the development of several of the ISO TC211 19000 series standards. Cooperation between the two organizations was mutually beneficial, resulting in the interoperability of data, products and services.

The Conference took note of the report.

Cooperation with the International Electrotechnical Commission (IEC)

Rear Admiral BARBOR (Director, IHB) said that cooperation between IHO and IEC in developing Marine Information Objects (MIO) for use in ECDIS in association with ENC's, had been pursued through the joint IHO-IEC Harmonizing Group on MIOs. IHO would continue to play an active role in the Group's work. Further information was provided in the CHRIS report to the Conference.

The Conference took note of the report.

Cooperation with the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting (ATCM), the Council of Managers of National Antarctic Programmes (COMNAP) and the International Association of Antarctica Tour Operators (IAATO)

Captain GORZIGLIA (Director, IHB) said IHO played an active part in the annual Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meetings, reporting on the status of hydrographic surveys and INT Chart production. As a result of IHO's participation, Consultative Parties were being encouraged to step up their efforts to coordinate hydrographic surveying and charting activities through HCA, to contribute to the development of the INT chart scheme for Antarctic waters, and to promote the international nature of their Antarctic activities. At the most recent ATCM in April 2007, IHO had proposed holding a seminar at the next ATCM meeting in order to raise awareness of the importance of hydrography in Antarctica. Effective partnership with COMNAP was continuing. Regarding cooperation with IAATO, he emphasized the importance of collecting data to provide a greater depth of understanding about that continent. IAATO had distributed among its associates the forms "Collection and Rendering of Hydrographic Data" to be used when reporting new data. He drew attention to IAATO's offer to use ships of opportunity to support hydrographic activity in Antarctica.

The Conference took note of the report.

Cooperation with the Pan American Institute of Geography and History (PAIGH)

Captain GORZIGLIA (Director, IHB) said that IHO had been instrumental in having the status of the PAIGH Working Group on Hydrography raised to the status of a Committee. Another recent achievement had been the translation of the Manual on Hydrography into Spanish. It should be noted that PAIGH was a consultative body of the Organization of American States and enjoyed good relations with the Inter-American Development Bank, thus providing an opening for resources for development. Other developments included PAIGH's participation in the most recent meeting of regional Hydrographic Offices.

The Conference took note of the report.

Cooperation with the South Pacific Applied Geo-Science Commission (SOPAC)

Rear Admiral BARBOR (Director, IHB) said the two organizations remained in close contact. SOPAC coordinated geophysical surveys of the South Pacific region that could yield valuable data for

Hydrographic Offices, while the data collected by the Hydrographic Offices were useful to geophysical scientists. Exchanges of data were therefore of mutual benefit.

The Conference took note of the report.

Cooperation with the International Federation of Surveyors (FIG)

Captain GORZIGLIA (Director, IHB) said the IHB had maintained a very good working relationship with the FIG, and especially with the Chairman of Commission 4, on hydrography. A new era in FIG/IHO relations had opened up since 2003, with participation by IHO in several FIG meetings, joint FIG-IHO-ICA work on the International Advisory Board on Standards of Competence, and the production by FIG of a CD containing Commission 4 publications and papers. IHO was also working with FIG on the important question of the economic benefits to be derived from hydrographic activities.

The Conference took note of the report.

Mr. LEYZACK (Observer, International Federation of Surveyors) speaking at the invitation of the President, said the theme of the FIG Council's work programme for 2007-2010 is "Building the Capacity", which had been incorporated into all its work plans. FIG's Commission 4 planned to cooperate fully with IHO in that area.

Cooperation with the World Meteorological Organization (WMO)

The PRESIDENT OF THE DIRECTING COMMITTEE said that WMO had regularly sent observers to meetings of the IHO Commission on the Promulgation of Radio Navigational Warnings. At the request of WMO, IHO had informed Member States of continuing incidents of vandalism to the WMO's data-gathering buoys, and IHO Member States were requested to alert the widest possible maritime audience to the problem.

The Conference took note of the report.

Cooperation on Spatial Data Infrastructure (SDI) activities

The PRESIDENT recalled that the relevant information had been provided earlier in the session.

The Conference took note of the report.

(Agenda item 4 b)

PROGRAMME No. 2 CAPACITY BUILDING AND TECHNICAL COOPERATION (CONF.17/WP.2)

Captain GORZIGLIA (Director, IHB), speaking in his capacity as Chairman of the IHO Capacity Building Committee (CBC), introduced the report. He thanked all the members of the Committee for their contributions and teamwork. The countries hosting the four meetings of the CBC since the Committee's formation in 2003 had been selected to cover as many regions as possible, and the meetings had been held in conjunction with events beneficial to those regions.

One of the first actions of the Committee had been to update publication M-2 (*National Maritime Policies and Hydrographic Services*), in the light of United Nations General Assembly resolutions A/RES/57/141, A/RES/58/240, A/RES/59/24 and A/RES/60/30, which recognized the work of the IHO and encouraged capacity building. The publication had been distributed at various meetings and was widely used. The Committee had also agreed on a definition of the term 'capacity building'

specific to the IHO, to indicate that the Organization supported capacity building but did not initiate it.

The IHO capacity building strategy reflected regional differences in the stage of development of hydrographic surveying and nautical charting capability. Countries in the first stage were capable of collecting and circulating the nautical information necessary to maintain existing charts and to keep publications up to date. Those in the second phase could conduct hydrographic surveys, and those in the third phase could produce their own nautical charts and publications. The capacity building management plan was based on needs identified by the RHCs and incorporated into the capacity building work programme. That programme was part of the general IHO work programme approved by each Conference.

The proposal to establish a capacity building fund had received strong support from Member States and had been adopted. The Fund, which comprised both an IHO budget allocation and contributions from Member States, provided minimum resources to support a number of capacity building activities. Technical visits had been paid to 52 countries in order to assess their capacity building requirements and to organize technical workshops, technical seminars and courses.

Experience to date had shown that the CBC was an effective and efficient body and that its terms of reference were appropriate, enabling it to avoid unnecessary bureaucracy. Nevertheless, the success of IHO's capacity building activities would depend on input from the RHCs. Publication S-55, *Status of Hydrographic Surveying and Nautical Charting Worldwide* (3rd edition), had been revised, providing opportunities for identifying capacity building needs and raising awareness of the importance of hydrography.

He urged Member States to take advantage of the capacity building opportunities available, and requested RHC chairmen to keep the CBC informed of their requirements as well as their potential for providing capacity building in other regions. Member States should bear in mind the usefulness of performance measurement.

In response to a query by IGA BESSERO (France), the PRESIDENT said that the proposals in paragraph 6 of the report did not require formal adoption.

Dr. YEON (Republic of Korea) said his country was contributing US\$ 100,000 per year to the IHO for capacity building and would consider increasing its contribution in future. He thanked the Bureau for promoting capacity building in Member States.

Mr. BISSUEL (Monaco) emphasized the importance of ensuring synergy with the activities of the IMO, World Bank and the International Monetary Fund relevant to technical cooperation and capacity building. Regional coordination was another useful mechanism for ensuring that developing countries could benefit from the work of the CBC.

Mrs DUNN (United Kingdom) endorsed the report and congratulated the CBC on the momentum it had achieved. PRO 18 acknowledged the importance of the work of the CBC, while drawing attention to the persistent problem of human resources. The secondment of Captain Barritt had made possible 41 technical visits, which showed that there was a definite advantage to be gained by supplying personnel to CBC for defined periods. She emphasized the importance of maintaining and updating the S-55 database. She looked forward to hearing how CBC would measure its performance in order to gauge its value both financially and for training purposes. Her country was considering the extent of its future involvement in the work of the CBC.

The PRESIDENT reiterated the gratitude of the Conference for the contribution made by Captain Barritt to capacity building.

Captain GORZIGLIA (Director, IHB) added that the IHO had initially allocated more funds to the RHCs than were actually needed, before they had had time to estimate their requirements and to propose projects. The contribution made by the Republic of Korea in 2006 would therefore be used in 2007, now that the CBC had a clearer idea of how the funds should be spent.

The PRESIDENT said he took it that the Conference wished to note the report.

It was so agreed.

Captain GORZIGLIA (Director, IHB) introduced the report on IHO technical cooperation, technical visits, seminars and workshops. There had been little feedback on some of the projects, notably the Central American hydrographic project, the Lake Victoria project, the West Indian Ocean marine highway project and the project in the Gulf of Honduras. The CBC would however be continuing its work in those regions.

The technical visits had been extremely informative. They had been funded partly by the IHO and partly by Member States. For instance, the visits of the West African Action Team to eight countries in West Africa, and the visit to countries in the Meso-American and Caribbean Hydrographic Commission, had been financed almost entirely by the countries themselves. Two seminars had been held, one at the premises of the International Maritime Academy (IMA) and the other with the assistance of the Mexican Navy, and it was hoped to continue that activity. Although there had been only four workshops, they had all been very well attended. The participants had been briefed on the importance of hydrography and on ways of increasing their hydrographic capability.

He drew attention to the standard model of the content of technical seminars in Annex A to the report and invited suggestions for improving it.

Mr. ZENONOS (Cyprus) said that IMO, IHO and IMA had provided considerable assistance to the countries in the southern Mediterranean. Unfortunately, however, although training, software and hardware had been provided, the project had still not been implemented because IMA, which had supplied the systems, had recently been closed down. He requested help from IHO in completing the project.

The PRESIDENT OF THE DIRECTING COMMITTEE said that the IMA and IHO had cooperated in applying for funding from the European Union to increase surveillance of the hydrographic capacity of Mediterranean countries and improve cartographic capability and production. Both projects had been completed within European Union directives, but follow-up actions were now required. Discussions had been held with the IMA before it closed to determine how the activities could be maintained, and Spain, which currently held the Chair of the Mediterranean and Black Seas Hydrographic Commission (MBSHC), had indicated that the subject would be considered at its next meeting, to be held in Malta in October 2007.

Admiral ABRAMOV (Russian Federation) said the project financed by MEDA (the European Union financial instrument for implementation of the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership) had also been intended to include enhancement of the infrastructure of countries bordering the Black Sea. How far had negotiations progressed in that respect?

The PRESIDENT OF THE DIRECTING COMMITTEE replied that the project proposal had been submitted to the European Union in 2005, but had not been accepted. It had not yet been determined whether an organization such as IHO could request funds from the European Union. He hoped the MBSHC meeting would take the project forward.

Mr ZENONOS (Cyprus) thanked the President of the Directing Committee, on behalf of all the countries involved in the project, for his continuing efforts to resolve the problem.

The PRESIDENT said he took it that the Conference wished to note the report.

It was so agreed.

(Agenda item 4c)

PROGRAMME No. 3 TECHNIQUES AND STANDARDS SUPPORT (CONF.17/WP.3)

The PRESIDENT recalled that the report of the Worldwide Electronic Navigational Chart Data Base (WEND) Committee had already been received and noted.

Report of the Committee on Hydrographic Requirements for Information Systems (CHRIS)

Captain WARD (Australia), Chairman of the Committee on Hydrographic Requirements for Information Systems (CHRIS), introducing the report of the Committee, said that CHRIS had undergone a number of organizational changes to make it more effective, including a review of its technical work programme, with the active participation not only of Member States but also of ‘expert contributors’ from industry and stakeholder groups, and the participation of certain nongovernmental international organizations. A plan had been drawn up for the transition from S-57, the IHO transfer standard for digital hydrographic data (edition 3.1), to S-100, the ISO-compliant geospatial standard for hydrographic data. Care had been taken to consider the impact of the transition on hydrographic offices, ECDIS manufacturers and users, and the timetable had been found to be predictable and realistic. He emphasized that the transition would not adversely affect users of the S-57 standard.

Progress on certain items in the Committee’s work programme had been affected by low rates of participation, although in other areas the use of information technology had increased efficiency and enabled Member States for whom travel was difficult to participate. Minor revisions had been made to the terms of reference of CHRIS to bring them into line with those proposed for the Hydrographic Standards and Specifications Committee and the Inter-Regional Coordination Committee. He hoped the Conference would approve the CHRIS programme and its revised terms of reference.

IGA BESSERO (France) said that he approved the report in principle, although the French version of the document was lacking Annex G, which contained the revised Terms of Reference.

The PRESIDENT said he took it that the Conference wished CHRIS to continue its work and noted the revised Terms of Reference.

It was so agreed.

Rapporteur : Mr. Steven DEBRECHT (United States of America)

CONTENTS

Consideration of the Reports on the Work Programme 2002–2007 (Agenda item 4) (continued)

Programme 3 - Techniques and Standards support (cont.)

Programme 4 - Information Management and Public Relations

Programme 5 - General Organization Development

Resolution expressing gratitude to the Host Country

Approval of the proposed IHO Work Programme 2008-2012

**CONSIDERATION OF THE REPORTS ON THE WORK PROGRAMME 2002–2007
(Agenda item 4) (cont.)**

**PROGRAMME No. 3 TECHNIQUES AND STANDARDS SUPPORT
(CONF.17/WP.3) (continued)**

**Report of the Committee on Hydrographic Requirements for Information Systems (CHRIS)
(cont.)**

The PRESIDENT announced that Annex G of the report was now available in the French language and that an opportunity to comment on it would be provided later in the day.

Report on the Work on the Publication on Limits of Oceans and Seas (S-23)

The PRESIDENT OF THE DIRECTING COMMITTEE, introducing the report, explained the history of the revision of IHO Publication S-23 since the 1977 decision of the XIth IHC. Thirty years on, the work remained incomplete owing to the contentious and highly sensitive nature of the political issues involved. Recent bilateral discussions did not seem to have made significant progress towards a resolution.

The PRESIDENT noted that three delegations wished to make statements. Following those statements, he would decide whether to invite further comments.

Mr. Young-Wan SONG (Republic of Korea) made a statement.¹

Vice-Admiral Gyong O JO (Democratic People's Republic of Korea) made a statement.²

¹ Reproduced in Annex A

² Reproduced in Annex B

Dr. KATO (Japan) made a statement.³

The PRESIDENT said that, to avoid protracted debate, he would allow a maximum of two further interventions on the item.

Mr. Young-Wan SONG (Republic of Korea) said that, in the view of his delegation, there were two options: to resume voting on the final draft of the 4th edition of Publication S-23; or, if the Conference was of the opinion that a new draft was needed, to form a working group of interested parties which would pay special attention to the issue of names.

Replying to a point raised by the delegation of Japan, he said that the concurrent use of different names pending agreement on a single name was fully in conformity with IHO Technical Resolution A 4.2.6. That resolution endorsed the principle of simultaneous recognition of different names for a shared geographical feature when the countries concerned could not agree on a single name.

His delegation took a flexible attitude and was open to any constructive approach that might produce a mutually acceptable solution. Dialogue and negotiation in good faith were the best means of resolving the issue. However, if productive bilateral consultation was impossible owing to the unwillingness of one party, the only alternative would be to consider the other options he had mentioned. The publication of the 4th edition of S-23 should not be delayed any longer.

The PRESIDENT noted that the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and of Japan had nothing to add. Clearly, the issue was highly significant for the countries concerned. He was anxious to ensure that the Conference did nothing to prolong the dispute in any way.

There were five possible solutions, none of which would be acceptable in all quarters. The first option was to publish the 4th edition of S-23 leaving any unresolved matters in the same format as in the 3rd edition, however distressing that might be to some Member States. The second option was to withdraw S-23 completely, but that would amount to an abrogation of IHO's duty to mariners at sea. The third option was to re-establish the working group that had met in 1953, although it was unclear what such a group could achieve. Fourthly, S-23 could be published in two volumes, the first of which would cover all the agreed issues while referring to the second volume, which would not be published, for the matters which remained unresolved. The final option was to republish the 4th edition of S-23 in the form in which it had appeared a few years earlier, including some blank pages on which it would be stated, without further explanation, that certain names were in dispute.

He urged the Conference to choose one of those options in order to make progress. If nothing was done there would be no 4th edition of S-23, the extant edition would be 53 years out of date and the user community would be understandably dissatisfied. His own, impartial view was that the fourth and fifth options were the most appropriate, although he personally preferred the fourth one. He wished to avoid putting the matter to a vote.

He invited comments on the appropriateness of delaying publication of a second volume. There being none, he suggested that a drafting committee could meet during the coffee break to prepare the draft of a proposal by the IHB based on the fourth option. It would then be for the Conference to decide whether to debate that proposal. He asked whether there was any objection to publishing S-23 in two volumes, the first of which would contain all the data agreed upon over the past 50 years, the second to be withheld until the international issues had been resolved.

Dr. KATO (Japan) said that it was difficult to respond to this proposal and that he reserved his response.

The PRESIDENT suspended discussion of the item until after the coffee break.

³ Reproduced in Annex C

Report on the Work of the IHO Committee on the Hydrographic Dictionary (S-32)

The PRESIDENT OF THE DIRECTING COMMITTEE, introducing the report, said that the Bureau would report again in due course on further progress on the Dictionary.

The report was noted.

Report of the Working Group on Standards for Hydrographic Surveys (S-44)

The PRESIDENT OF THE DIRECTING COMMITTEE said that the Working Group was in the closing stages of preparing the final draft of the 5th edition of S-44. He hoped it would soon be circulated to Member States for their consideration and comments.

The report was noted.

Report of the IHO Tidal Committee (TC)

Mr. Steve SHIPMAN (Professional Assistant (Hydrography), IHB), speaking as Secretary of the Tidal Committee, drew attention to a draft amendment to IHO Technical Resolution A 6.8. The Committee wished to encourage all Member States to pursue the development of digital tide tables with built-in functionality and intelligence. It had therefore proposed that it be tasked to prepare standards for digital tide tables. Since the issue of the written report, the proposed amendment to Technical Resolution A 6.2 had been approved by the requisite number of States, as reported in Circular Letter 75/2006. The printed copies of Volume I of the French Manual of Tides had been received by the IHB shortly before the XVIIth Conference, and would shortly be distributed to francophone Member States. The English translation had not yet been received by the Bureau for proofreading. The Conference was invited to endorse the excellent working relationship established by the Committee with the Group of Experts of the Global Sea-Level Observing System (GLOSS) of the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC).

The Chairman of the Tidal Committee, Commander Page, had announced his intention to resign as Chairman at the Committee's next meeting, to be held in Halifax, Canada, in October 2007, on account of his impending retirement from the United Kingdom Hydrographic Office. Many other members of the Committee were also approaching retirement, so the Committee and its successor, the Tides and Vertical Datum Working Group, needed some new recruits, and he appealed to Member States to consider making nominations.

Rear Admiral ANDREASEN (United States of America), supported by Captain IBARRA (Chile), complimented the Committee on the progress of its work. He endorsed the proposed amendment to Technical Resolution A 6.8.

IGA BESSERO (France) joined the previous speaker in commending the work of the Committee. He supported the proposed amendment to Technical Resolution A 6.8, on condition that the title of the Committee appeared in full. He was in favour of tasking the Committee to prepare standards for digital tide tables, provided it was made clear that the work would be carried out in consultation with CHRIS. It should also be mentioned that the Regional Hydrographic Commissions were part of the effective working relationship with IOC/GLOSS.

The PRESIDENT said that he took it that the Conference wished to accept the report, taking special note of the Secretary's appeal for new blood on the Committee.

The report was adopted.

Report of the IHO Manual on Hydrography Working Group

Captain GORZIGLIA (Director, IHB), Chairman of the IHO Manual on Hydrography Working Group, expressed condolences to Australia for the loss of LCDR Peter Johnson, a member of the Working Group, who had passed away recently. The Working Group had met once during the reporting period to review the final draft of the Manual in English. The final text had been posted on the IHO website in May 2005. Venezuela had provided a Spanish translation, and Tunisia had recently offered to produce a French translation. The Bureau was grateful to both countries for their assistance. As the Working Group had completed its work, it was now dormant. It was proposed that the Conference should disband the Working Group, and that the technical resolution establishing its terms of reference and rules of procedure should be deleted. It was also proposed that whenever further work was required, the IHB Directing Committee should adopt the necessary measures and propose whatever action was necessary to ensure that the Manual was periodically reviewed and updated.

Rear Admiral ANDREASEN (United States of America) welcomed the publication of the Manual, a very necessary source of guidance for countries seeking to develop their hydrographic services. He commended the members of the Group for their work, and endorsed the proposal to abolish the Working Group.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Observer, FIG-International Federation of Surveyors) thanked IHO for producing the Manual and making it widely available to the hydrographic community. To make it more widely available, FIG had included the Manual in its CD and publications.

The report and the proposals contained in it were adopted.

Report on Training, including the Relationship with the International Maritime Academy

Captain GORZIGLIA (Director, IHB), supplementing the information presented in the report, said another course was to be offered by the National Hydrographic School of Goa, India, and Member States had been informed by Circular Letter. Concerning multibeam courses, in the first quarter of 2007 a course had been offered in Norway, and another course would be given in Australia during the second half of the year, for which some students from Regional Hydrographic Commissions would receive support from the Capacity Building Committee. Information on additional training opportunities was posted on the capacity building section of the IHO website.

The International Maritime Academy (IMA) in Trieste, Italy, had ceased to function in October 2006. The Italian Government was considering the possibility of establishing a new academy with a different legal status, but the IHB was not yet aware of any progress in that regard.

Rear Admiral ANDREASEN (United States of America) pointed out that the report did not include any of the category A or B courses offered in the United States.

IGA BESSERO (France) said that the report listed only an arbitrary selection among the courses available worldwide, which might prove confusing.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Observer, FIG-International Federation of Surveyors), speaking as a Vice-Chairman of the International Advisory Board on Standards of Competence, noted that IHO publication S-47 contained a more complete list of training courses in hydrography and nautical cartography.

Captain GORZIGLIA (Director, IHB) apologized for any confusion caused by the report, and explained that it had not been intended to repeat the information provided in publication S-47, or to list all the courses available. The report merely mentioned some of the training opportunities offered during the reporting period.

Rear Admiral ANDREASEN (United States of America) agreed with the observation by the representative of France. He encouraged the Bureau to move to Web-based reporting instead of publishing partial lists of training courses.

The PRESIDENT said that, in line with that suggestion, the report would be put on the IHO website.

The Conference took note of the report.

FIG/IHO/ICA International Advisory Board on Standards of Competence for Hydrographic Surveyors and Nautical Cartographers

Mr. JOHNSTON (Observer, FIG-International Federation of Surveyors), speaking as Vice-Chairman of the International Advisory Board (IAB), said the work of the IAB was done by 10 volunteers, two from the International Cartographic Association and four each from the IHO and FIG. The Board conducted two main activities: developing and maintaining standards of competence, and reviewing courses and programmes for recognition. The Board would remain active in those two areas in future. It was currently examining options for obtaining additional funding for its activities. In response to growing demand for a mechanism for recognizing programmes offering professional certification in hydrography for individuals, the Board was also contemplating work in the area of individual competency schemes. FIG had encouraged the Board to pursue work in that area, and the Board was looking for similar support from IHO. The Conference was requested to endorse the Board's development of a procedure for recognizing individual certification schemes and preparing standards for them.

Captain NAIRN (Australia) strongly supported the proposal to develop such a procedure. Since 1994 Australia had had a scheme to ensure the professional competency of hydrographers collecting hydrographic data, either to enhance the safety of navigation or for other purposes. The programme had so far received applications for certification from 140 applicants, 20 of whom had come from outside the Australia/New Zealand region. Evidently, the programme was meeting a demand for professional certification from the international community. In Australia, several state legislatures were considering legislation that would require persons undertaking hydrographic surveys in their regions to be certified. Queensland already insisted on certification. The proposed international recognition of individual competency certification schemes would improve the standardization of levels of professional certification for hydrographic surveyors, and therefore benefit the worldwide hydrographic community. Australia supported the Board's work on individual competency schemes, and recommended adoption of the proposal contained in paragraph 6.1 of document CONF.17/WP.3.

IGA BESSERO (France) also supported the proposal. He noted that the English version asked the Conference to endorse the development of a procedure for the recognition of individual certification schemes, whereas the French version asked it to approve the implementation of the procedure. The Conference could not approve the implementation of a procedure that had yet to be developed.

Professor EHLERS (Germany) questioned whether matters of individual certification fell within IAB's terms of reference. The document appeared to indicate that the IAB itself had not really come to a decision on the question. More information was needed about the implications of a certification procedure.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Observer, FIG-International Federation of Surveyors) explained that the purpose of the proposal was to look into a possible procedure for the Board to follow in recognizing programmes such as Australia's. The Board had not yet decided that the task was practicable. It was however responding to pressure from industry and from other Member States and organizations, including FIG, anxious to set a gold standard of competency in the hydrographic profession. With the increasing development of national and regional programmes for individual certification, various members of the Board, including FIG, felt the matter should at least be investigated and addressed.

The PRESIDENT proposed that the word “development” in the proposal should be replaced by “investigation”. The proposal would then read: “The Conference is requested to endorse the IAB’s investigation of a process for recognition of national, regional, or industrial schemes of individual certification, and the preparation of standards for such individual certification schemes”.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Observer, FIG-International Federation of Surveyors) said that modification would be acceptable.

Captain NAIRN (Australia) said the representative of Germany had raised a valid question concerning the IAB’s Terms of Reference. It was being proposed to expand the Terms of Reference to allow the IAB to develop a procedure for recognizing individual certification schemes. The first step would be to study the feasibility of doing so, but the Conference should endorse the full proposal, so that if the Board found that recognition of individual certification schemes was within its competence, it could proceed with the task.

Professor EHLERS (Germany) reiterated that he could not endorse the full proposal without additional information. He would agree to the Board investigating a possible procedure, but when that had been done it should submit a proposal explaining all the implications of the new work. It might then be appropriate to expand its terms of reference.

Rear Admiral ANDREASEN (United States of America) agreed that the IAB should be authorized to look into the issue of recognizing individual certification schemes. The work would however be very resource-intensive, and he shared the concerns expressed about its implications.

The PRESIDENT said the Conference seemed to agree to allow the IAB to proceed with the investigation, but not necessarily with the procedure itself.

Captain NAIRN (Australia) said that if the proposal was to be amended along those lines, he suggested that instead of waiting another five years for the IAB to report, it should be asked to report by Circular Letter, so that an earlier decision could be made whether to proceed.

The PRESIDENT said that if the Conference was agreed to that suggestion, the proposal would be amended accordingly.

It was so agreed.

The Conference adopted the report and the proposals as amended.

Report of the Joint IHO-IOC Guiding Committee for the General Bathymetric Chart of the Oceans (GEBCO)

Commander LUSIANI (Italy), presenting the report on behalf of the Chairman of the GEBCO Guiding Committee, highlighted some recent developments with regard to GEBCO. A major event had been the celebration of the GEBCO centenary in 2003, with the publication of a history of GEBCO and a centenary edition of the GEBCO Digital Atlas. Another important activity had been the reorganization of the GEBCO website. In addition, in response to a request from the Secretariats of the IHO and the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC) of UNESCO, the Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure for the Guiding Committee and its two sub-committees, the Sub-Committee on Undersea Feature Names and the Sub-Committee on Ocean Mapping (formerly the Sub-Committee on Digital Bathymetry) had been rewritten. The Conference was asked to endorse the new texts, set out in Annexes A, B and C to the report (CONF.17/WP.3). The Conference was also asked to urge IHO Member States to contribute actively to GEBCO by encouraging, supporting and facilitating the submission of bathymetric data. Other recommendations to the Conference appeared in paragraph 6 of the report.

IGA BESSERO (France) observed that the report featured some extremely complex texts which Member States had not had much time to study. There were several inconsistencies in the French version. It was proposed, for example, that the renewal of membership was to be decided by the members themselves, and that some members of the Sub-Committee on Ocean Mapping would be appointed by the Subcommittee itself. That was not the normal procedure for IHO bodies. He could not endorse the new Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure as they stood. Nor was he convinced that recommendation 4, in paragraph 6 of the report, was well-founded; it was not sufficient merely to make available data from ENC files. The first step should be to define what need was to be met by extending GEBCO coverage to inshore areas, and then to consider how to meet it.

Dr. YEON (Republic of Korea) also noted several inconsistencies in the provisions for decision-making in the Rules of Procedure. He requested the GEBCO Guiding Committee to re-examine those provisions and report to Member States via Circular Letter.

The PRESIDENT suggested that the Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure should be referred back to the GEBCO Guiding Committee for revision and subsequent reissue via Circular Letter.

Commander LUSIANI (Italy) said since the report was submitted, the Guiding Committee had itself noticed some inconsistencies, and was planning to review the Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure at its next meeting in October 2007.

The GEBCO report was referred back to the GEBCO Guiding Committee for revision and subsequent reissue via Circular Letter.

Report of the IHO Data Centre for Digital Bathymetry (DCDB)

Rear Admiral BARBOR (Director, IHB) recalled that the IHO Data Centre for Digital Bathymetry had been established as the focal point for the collection and distribution of ocean bathymetric information. It had expanded its capabilities over the past five years, and had experienced a significant increase in the amount of information collected and provided. Through the database the bathymetric information was available to IHO Member States, and also to any organization in need of it. The Centre's online information distribution capabilities had been enhanced, and its databases expanded. A number of other products had been developed to provide useful information to the various user communities.

The report was adopted.

Report on the Work of the Advisory Board on Hydrographic, Geodetic and Marine Geo-Scientific Aspects of the Law of the Sea (ABLOS)

The PRESIDENT OF THE DIRECTING COMMITTEE recalled that until November 2006 the Board had membership drawn from three organizations: IHO, the International Association of Geodesy (IAG) and the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC). In November, the IOC had informed the Bureau that it intended to withdraw in order to focus its efforts on the IOC Advisory Body of Experts on the Law of the Sea. It would however continue to cooperate with ABLOS.

There had been five ABLOS business meetings in the past five years, and two conferences held at the IHB premises in Monaco. Another conference was planned for February 2008. Following the withdrawal of the IOC, ABLOS had modified its Terms of Reference, and the new terms had been approved by both IHO and IAG. The two organizations now had four members each, as well as an ex officio member from the United Nations Division of Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea.

The fourth edition of the Manual on Technical Aspects of the United Nations Convention on the Law (IHO publication S-51) had been completed. It was available in digital form, as a free download from the IHO website. The new edition incorporated the latest knowledge and technology, including new

material and much improved graphics. A Spanish text was in preparation, and it was hoped that a French version would soon be available as well.

The report was adopted.

Report on the Work of the IHO Commission on the Promulgation of Radio Navigational Warnings (CPRNW)

Mr. DOHERTY (United States of America), Chairman of the Commission, recalled that the main objective of CPRNW was to monitor and guide IMO/IHO promulgation of radio navigational warnings under the World Wide Navigational Warning Service (WWNWS). The membership was composed essentially of Member States acting as NAVAREA Coordinators.

The Commission had held three meetings since the previous Conference, two of them at the IHB, and one in Buenos Aires, Argentina.

The main product of the Commission's work had been the establishment of an IMO/IHO/WMO Correspondence Group on the Arctic, tasked with looking for ways to expand maritime information services to the Arctic Ocean. Work had also been done on the Caspian Sea and the Black Sea.

A systematic review of IMO/IHO/WMO WWNWS guidance documents had also been undertaken, to ensure that all documents were up-to-date and consistent throughout. The Commission had also prepared an informational CD, which was available for distribution.

Captain BARRITT (United Kingdom), speaking as Vice-Chairman of the IHO Capacity Building Committee, expressed his appreciation of the Committee's ongoing support in developing in all coastal States the crucial first phase of hydrographic capability, namely the ability to collect, organize and disseminate both chart updating information and critical navigational warnings. Without that capability worldwide, IHO would not be able to persuade mariners of the integrity of its products, whether on paper or electronic.

The report was adopted.

Report on the work on the Publication on Limits of Oceans and Seas (S-23) (continued)

The PRESIDENT asked the three delegations which had made statements to inform their Governments that most of S-23 was not in dispute and could be published immediately, and advise the IHB whether their Governments would agree to the publication, of Volume 1, omitting the disputed portion.

With that proviso, the report was adopted.

PROGRAMME No 4 INFORMATION MANAGEMENT AND PUBLIC RELATIONS (CONF.17/WP.4)

Report on IHO Publications

Captain GORZIGLIA (Director, IHB) introduced the report. Work was in progress to make the classifications "Miscellaneous Publications" and "Special Publications" more meaningful. Although a number of publications were still being produced on paper, there was a growing trend towards digital documents. The distribution of printed documents took place by post. The annual distribution of all digital publications on a CD-ROM had been discontinued since they could all be downloaded from the web site, which was now the most popular source.

The maintenance and updating of publications was regarded as broadly the responsibility of IHO. He drew attention to the information on pricing policy in the report, noting that “The income is relevant” should read “The income is not relevant.”

Mr. DOHERTY (United States of America) noted that publication S-53, Appendix 1, was missing from the list on page 9 of the report.

The report, as amended, was adopted.

Report on IT Equipment

Rear Admiral BARBOR (Director IHB) reported on the maintenance and new purchases of IT equipment required to maintain the efficiency of the IHO’s services. One significant innovation had been the installation of the S-63 Signature Server, intended to provide IHO S-63 Data Servers with an online signature service. The service was externally funded and had minimal cost implications for the IHB. A second major innovation was the implementation of a customized document management system, which had been developed for the IHB by the Chilean Hydrographic Service.

The report was adopted.

Report on IHO Web Site Development

Rear Admiral BARBOR (Director IHB) reported on a major upgrade of the web site that had taken place in 2003, based in large part on comments from Member States. A second upgrade had now been completed, and would go online shortly after the Conference. The site was intended to provide virtually all the information a Member State might need. He noted that Seven Cs had purchased the domain name “iho.org” and would donate it to the Organization at a ceremony later that day.

Mr. SPITTAL (New Zealand) commended the IHO web site, which he found very informative and helpful.

The report was adopted.

Report on Public Relations

The PRESIDENT OF THE DIRECTING COMMITTEE drew attention to some highlights of the Organization’s public relations activities, including the preparations for the adoption by the United Nations of a World Hydrography Day, and the celebration of the first WHD on 21 June 2006.

The IHB offices had been visited by the Foreign Minister of Monaco on several occasions. Other distinguished visitors had included ministers and ambassadors, as well as the President of the World Maritime University and the Secretary-General of the International Association of Marine Aids to Navigation and Lighthouse Authorities (IALA).

The report was adopted.

PROGRAMME No. 5 GENERAL ORGANIZATION DEVELOPMENT (CONF.17/WP.5)

Report of the IHO Legal Advisory Committee

Ms. WEBSTER (United States of America), Chairwoman of the IHO Legal Advisory Committee, reported that the Committee, composed of 15 Member States, had held no formal meetings during the period under review, but had worked through correspondence. Its agenda included the legal personality of the IHO and statutes of the EAHC. A response on both issues had been provided to the

IHB. Some members of the Committee had been involved in the modernization of the IHO Convention.

The report was adopted.

Report on Translation

Captain GORZIGLIA (Director IHB) described the present position. IHO documents were translated into French and Spanish by professional translators, and translation into English was done by IHO administrative staff.

There was usually sufficient in-house capacity for day-to-day translation work, but at times of peak demand the IHB had difficulty in finding qualified external technical translators. The Member States should be tolerant of occasional late delivery of translated documents, particularly those in French.

With regard to publications, the IHB did have some capability to provide translations, but in the case of very complex or voluminous publications it often had recourse to Member States, and was grateful for their assistance.

IGA BESSERO (France) expressed concern about the quality of some of the translated documents. He urged the Bureau not to underestimate the resources needed to maintain a high quality of translation, especially in view of the growing volume of documentation.

The PRESIDENT invited the Bureau to note those observations.

The report was adopted.

Report on IHO Membership

The PRESIDENT OF THE IHB reported that six countries had joined the Organization since the previous Conference, bringing the total to 78.

Four more countries – Bulgaria, Ireland, Mauritania and Qatar – had now received the requisite votes of approval from two-thirds of the Member States, but had not yet deposited their instruments of accession. Cameroon and Sierra Leone were still in the approval process, and he urged Member States to vote as soon as possible on their applications.

Three Member States had had their rights and benefits suspended, but the Directing Committee was in constant touch with them with a view to having them reinstated.

The report was adopted.

Report on Host Government Affairs

The PRESIDENT OF THE IHB reported that relations with the Host Government had been very good. Monaco's Department of External Relations had efficiently processed applications by States to join the Organization, as well as approvals of the Protocol of Amendments to the Convention. Thirteen approvals had been received so far.

The IHB had celebrated the centenary of GEBCO with the participation of the Host Government. The Directing Committee had participated in the celebrations marking the Centenary of the Arctic Expedition by Prince Albert I and a similar expedition in 2006 by Prince Albert II. He thanked the delegation of Canada, and especially Dr. Narayanan, for their involvement. Prince Albert had also participated in the celebration of World Hydrography Day, and had delivered an address.

The report was adopted.

RESOLUTION EXPRESSING GRATITUDE TO THE HOST COUNTRY

The PRESIDENT said he took it that the Conference wished to adopt a resolution requesting the delegation of Monaco to convey to H.S.H. Prince Albert II and the Government of the Principality of Monaco the sincere gratitude of the Conference for the generous support provided to the Organization in so many ways. He read out the proposed resolution. (*See the text page 107*)

The resolution was adopted by acclamation.

APPROVAL OF THE PROPOSED IHO WORK PROGRAMME 2008-2012 (CONF.17/REP/01 Rev.1) (Agenda item 5)

Captain GORZIGLIA (Director, IHB) recalled that according to Article 23 (c) of the IHO General Regulations, the Directing Committee, taking into consideration the work of Committees and Working Groups, was required to present to each International Hydrographic Conference the Work Programme to be carried out during the following period, including its financial implications.

In September 2005 the Directing Committee had requested the Chairmen of all IHO bodies to provide their input so that the Work Programme would be as complete as possible.

On the basis of the information supplied, the proposed Work Programme for the period 2008-2012 had been distributed on 31 January 2007 by means of Circular Letter No. 14, together with the proposed budget for the period.

In the light of comments received from Member States on 5 April 2007, Circular Letter No. 19 was sent out, containing Revision 1 of the proposed Work Programme. That version was now submitted before the Conference for its approval.

He drew attention to the new layout for the Programme. There was an overall Concept for each of the five programmes, an Objective for each programme element, and a number of Tasks by which to achieve the objectives. Spreadsheets were annexed to the Work Programme showing timetables and budgets.

Rear Admiral ANDREASEN (United States of America) said his delegation had found, when attempting to use the new Work Programme document in his country's budgetary allocation process, that it seemed to be little more than a list of meetings to be held or documents to be published, without any indication of what would be done with them. He hoped more detail would be added in future versions.

Captain BARRITT (United Kingdom), speaking as Vice-Chairman of the Capacity Building Committee, suggested that if the Organization had some form of performance management tool, its upper echelon could be included in the Work Programme in order to show Government agencies the purposes of the Organization and the routes it intended to follow to achieve them.

Mr. KRASTIŅŠ (Latvia) pointed out that the Baltic Sea Hydrographic Commission met only biennially, and consequently Task 1.1.6 should refer only to the years 2009 and 2011.

Mr. ESKILDSEN (Denmark), said that the year 2010 had been omitted from Task 1.1.1, referring to the Nordic Hydrographic Commission. A similar correction should be made to Annex A.

Dr. NARAYANAN (Canada) suggested that in future versions of the document, the regional hydrographic commissions could be asked to provide their own list of objectives. That would meet the request by the delegation of the United States for greater detail.

IGA BESSERO (France) suggested that one of the elements of Programme 5 could be the encouragement of a rapid approval process for the Protocol of Amendments to the Convention.

The PRESIDENT said that could be done by including Proposal 24, which encouraged the Contracting Parties to undertake all steps necessary to approve the Protocol as soon as possible.

Rear Admiral ANDREASEN (United States of America) asked whether it had been formally agreed when the next Extraordinary Conference would be held.

The PRESIDENT recalled that it had been decided through Proposal 17, to cancel Decision No. 5 of the previous EIHC. The next Extraordinary Conference would therefore be held in 2009.

The Work Programme, as amended, was adopted.

ANNEX A
TO THE SEVENTH PLENARY SESSION

STATEMENT
by
Mr. Young-wan SONG
Head of the Republic of Korea Delegation

Mr. President,

I thank Admiral Maratos and the IHB Directing Committee for the informative and comprehensive report on the work of the publication of "Limits of Oceans and Seas (S-23)."

The naming dispute over the sea area located between the Korean peninsula and the Japanese archipelago has been the object of intense debate, in particular with respect to the publication of a long-awaited 4th edition of the S-23. Since the vote on the draft of the 4th edition of the S-23 was interrupted in September 2002, the Government of the Republic of Korea has made sincere efforts to facilitate the publication of the 4th edition of the S-23. In particular, my government has exerted every possible effort to seek a mutually agreeable solution through bilateral consultations with Japan.

Although five rounds of bilateral consultations have been held since 2002, mostly at the hydrographic expert level, the outcome has been far from satisfactory. Japan's pronounced position of "no flexibility" throughout the meetings has impeded the constructive progress of the bilateral consultations.

In light of the differences which have been evident in the bilateral consultations and the resultant absence of agreement at this stage, the only option is to use both names "East Sea" and "Sea of Japan" in the 4th edition of the S-23.

Indeed, the concurrent use pending the reaching of agreement on a common name is in line with IHO Technical Resolution A.4.2.6. adopted in 1974. This resolution endorses the principle of simultaneous recognition of different names for a shared geographic feature when the countries concerned do not agree on a common name.

Mr. President,

The dual use of different names is evident in the editions of "Limits of Oceans and Seas" published so far. There are two cases in its first edition; four in the second edition, and five instances in the third edition. Even the unpublished final draft circulated in 2002 contained three cases of the use of concurrent names, those of : the English Channel (La Manche), the Dover Strait (Pas de Calais), and the Bay of Biscay (Golfe de Gascogne). This prevailing principle and practice should be followed in the naming of the sea area between Korea and Japan.

Together with the simultaneous use of the terms "East Sea" and "Sea of Japan," drawing new limits in the sea in question can be considered. This is in line with growing tendency to use electronic charts. The limits of the "Sea of Japan" designated in the third edition of the S-23 include the territorial waters and the EEZ of Korea. It is not only inappropriate but unjust to name a sea area where several countries claim their sovereignty and jurisdiction after a specific country without the consent, implicit or explicit, of other states directly concerned.

It is not our intention to use a single name of "East Sea" for the Japanese territorial waters or EEZ. In the same context, Korea cannot accept its territorial waters or EEZ being referred to as the "Sea of Japan". The name "Sea of Japan" is a legacy of the Japanese imperialism and its policy of aggression

of the past, especially during the colonial rule in the first half of the 20th century. Japan's insistence on the exclusive use of "Sea of Japan" is a reflection of its intention to continue this unjust historical legacy. We only hope that a clear injustice will be corrected and the name "East Sea" restored to its rightful place. It is indisputable that the Korean people have used the term "East Sea" for more than 2,000 years and 75 million people on the Korean Peninsula still use the name and will continue to do so. This is the most important factor to be considered in naming the sea in question.

In recent years, the international community has warmly responded to our efforts to restore "East Sea" to its rightful place. The simultaneous use of these two names is on the rise. The studies done by the Korean government and the Japanese government separately show that the percentage of world mapmakers using the name "East Sea" has increased rapidly from 2.8% in 2000 to 23.8% in 2007. The statistics are a strong indication that the name "East Sea" is increasingly being used internationally.

Mr. President,

The international community awaits an updated edition of the S-23, which is already long overdue. It is imperative that the new edition of the S-23 reflect limits and names of oceans and seas in an accurate and proper manner. Otherwise the new edition will not truly be able to serve its purpose. In this context, the single name "Sea of Japan" as employed in the third edition of the S-23 for the sea area in question should be changed. The simultaneous use of "East Sea" and "Sea of Japan" is the fairest and most desirable solution at this stage.

In closing, I would like to reiterate that the Korean government remains open to any constructive suggestions for a resolution of this pressing issue. It is our sincere hope that the wisdom and guidance of the IHO Member States at this Conference will bring us to a mutually agreeable and fair solution.

Thank you.

**ANNEX B
TO THE SEVENTH PLENARY SESSION**

**STATEMENT
by
Vice-Admiral Gyong O JO
Head of Democratic People's Republic of Korea Delegation**

Mr. President,

Work Programme No. 3 indicates that S-23 "Limits of Oceans and Seas" the 3rd Edition of 1953, is still the only valid one, but is out of stock and outdated.

The 11th International Hydrographic Conference in 1977 by Decision No. 17 tasked the Bureau to undertake a revision of the IHO publication S-23 "Limits of Oceans and Seas" but until now, the S-23 is still the same 53 years after the 3rd Edition.

During the 53 years, several sea name problems of the world have been solved but the sea name problem of the Eastern part of the Korean Peninsula has not been successfully solved by the two pages between 7.16 and 7.17.

So, the 4th Edition has not been completed.

The report on the Work Programme 2002-2007 indicates this matter is of a highly sensitive political nature and is not a technical one.

But I think that this proposal belongs in the IHO Technical Resolution A4.2.

So, I would like to discuss this matter in this Conference.

I am going to emphasize our stand briefly.

The sea name problem of the eastern part of the Korean Peninsula arose in the early 20th Century exactly in 1929 when IHO's Special publication S-23 was published.

So, it is the problem to be solved by IHO.

From the 6th Century B.C., our Korean people had called this sea "East Sea" and now have called this sea "East Sea of Korea" or "East Sea".

It was proved by many historical documents that it was named "Korean Sea" until the 19th Centuries even in Japan.

For example, the sea of the eastern part of the Korean peninsula was named "Korean Sea" and the Sea of the Pacific Ocean of the eastern part of Japan was named "Great Japan Sea" on the map "Sinchongmankukzondo" published by Japan in 1810.

After that, from the map on the "dae Nippon 4 Chongchondo" published by Japan in 1870, the sea area of the Korean Peninsula was written as "Korean Sea" and the west coastal sea area of Japan was written as "West Sea of Japan" and after that in 1910, this sea area was written as "Japan Sea" and in 1929 the name of "Japan sea" was fixed by S-23.

But, how has the world called this sea in the past centuries?

The sailors and hydrographic specialists of the European countries that have developed sea activities had called the Eastern Sea of the Korean Peninsula "Eastern Sea", "Oriental Sea" and "Korean Sea". For example, "Binland Map" edited by Italy in 1245 and 1247 it was written as "Mare Ocean Oriental" and we can find maps published in France and other countries where it was written as "East Sea" and "Oriental Sea".

Also maps edited by the United Kingdom in 1647, where it was written as "Mare de Corea", the maps published in UK, France, Russia, Italy and USA had fixed as "Korean Sea" until the end of the 19th century.

There was no doubt that the sailors and hydrographic specialists of the European countries had principles and regulations in naming the Sea.

But, the problem is, what is the reason why the sea name which had been called "Korean Sea" by the world was changed into "Japan Sea".

Representatives of Member States who know the Korean history can understand my remarks.

When the initial edition of S-23 was published in 1929, only Japanese representatives has participated in S-23 publication without the neighboring countries, even Korea and the result is clear for everybody.

Japan must abandon single name of "Japan Sea" because it is unbeautiful old skin name of the Sea.

Representatives of Member States and IHO must consider this problem and find the solution.

This problem must be solved as stipulated by the IHO Technical Resolutions and the international laws.

And also, we request that the famous sailors and hydrographic specialists of the world rename the sea of the eastern part of the Korean Peninsula with its original name that was used in the past centuries.

For this matter, we announce that our country intends to hold an international meeting with the Hydrographic Representatives of coastal states around the sea and geographical specialists under the chair of the IHB in the period that is convenient to the IHB.

Thank you.

**ANNEX C
TO THE SEVENTH PLENARY SESSION**

**STATEMENT
by
Dr. Shigeru KATO
Japan Delegation**

Thank you Mr. President,

Japan would like to make a comment to clarify our position.

Japan strongly believes that the IHO should not involve itself in political issues. But the claim made by the Republic of Korea has no historical and geographical reason but it has highly political intention.

Japan sincerely continues to have a bilateral talk with the Republic of Korea under recommendation of the IHB President and Member States.

Simple application of IHO Technical Resolution A4.2.6 might lead to a confusion of geographical names. The application of IHO Technical Resolution A4.2.6 would be limited to cases wherein a new consensus had been reached between Member States to apply technical resolution. Therefore, the resolution should not apply in the case of the Japan Sea. Although the Republic of Korea is asserting that both names should be used if a consensus cannot be reached, this goes against the greatest possible uniformity in nautical charts and documents, which is the objective of the IHO.

“Japan Sea” was adopted when it was being established and used in hydrographic charts and documents around the world at the time of the preparation of the First Edition of S-23. It was not Japan who named the area. Since the nineteenth century when modern hydrographic charts and documents first appeared, most hydrographic charts and documents throughout the world have employed the appellation Japan Sea.

Finally, we believe it is not appropriate to discuss on this issue at the IHO because the IHO is a technical and consultative organization.

Rapporteur : Mr. Sean HINDS (Canada)

CONTENTS

Finance Committee Report (Agenda item 6)

- Finance Report of IHO 2002-2006
- IHO five-year budget 2008-2012
- IHO budget for 2008
- Report of the Finance Committee Working Group on the salary scheme of the Secretary General and the Directors under the new structure of IHO
- Reappointment of the External Auditor

Report of the Eligibility Committee

Other Business

FINANCE COMMITTEE REPORT (Agenda item 6) (CONF.17/F/REP)

Finance Report of IHO 2002-2006 (CONF.17/F/01 Rev.1)

Mr. MAIDMENT (United Kingdom), Vice-Chairman of the Finance Committee, introduced document CONF.17/F/REP, which summarized the proceedings of the meetings of the Finance Committee held on Saturday 5 May 2007.

When discussing the five-year Finance Report for 2002-2006 in the light of the report by the President of the Directing Committee, several delegations had questioned the increase in long-distance travel costs. That increase was due to a reassessment of the entitlement to business-class travel together with the impact of the SPWG's recommendations, the capacity building programme and exceptional circumstances such as the tsunami in South East Asia. One delegation had expressed the view that resources for the Capacity Building Fund should not be taken from the running costs of the Organization, but that the Fund should be financed by voluntary contributions. In any event, the limit of 1.5% of the budget set by the Conference in 1982 should not be exceeded. In reply to questions about the alignment of IHB salaries for directors, professional assistants and translators, it had been explained that the Working Group's 2003 recommendations had been implemented with effect from 1 July instead of 1 January 2004. The salary grades applied had all been at one level lower than proposed by the consultants, but the indexation of salaries had been done to reflect Monaco civil service salaries and the IHB Staff Regulations. The Finance Report had been unanimously approved by the Finance Committee.

Mr. FARIS (United States of America) said that, notwithstanding several questions and one particular concern about the budget, the United States was pleased with the responsible and prudent management of the Organization's resources, which had avoided any increase in the size of the budget or in Member States' contributions.

The Finance Report for the period 2002-2006 was approved.

Proposed IHO five-year budget 2008-2012 (CONF.17/F/02/Rev.2 and 3)

Mr. MAIDMENT (United Kingdom), Vice-Chairman of the Finance Committee, said that the Finance Committee had considered the budget proposals contained in document CONF.17/F/02/Rev.2. A revised version had since been issued, in document CONF.17/F/02/Rev.3, to reflect the late notification of tonnage changes, resulting in an increase in the number of shares from 670 to 673. The budget had been drawn up according to the present number of shares. It did not include the possible accession of new Member States, or changes in national tonnages. Modifications resulting from salary changes under the new structure had not been taken into consideration. Over the first three-year period there would be no increase in the share value; in 2011 it would be limited to 1.5%, and in 2012 to 3%. When drawing up the annual budget, both those increases would be studied again in order to limit the financial impact as far as possible. The budget showed an annual surplus, which would decrease over the period.

Among the comments made on the proposed budgets, attention had been drawn to the difficulty of approving the budget prior to approval of the work programme. It had been pointed out that cross-references to the work programme were included in the budget, which would be adjusted to any programme changes made. Delegations had been further reassured about the size of the IHB's translation staff, and about containing expenditure relating to the new structure within the budget. One delegation had queried the fact that resources earmarked for the Capacity-Building Fund had exceeded the maximum of 1.5% of the budget established in 1982, amounting to about 2.35%. The Directing Committee had pointed out that the proposals reflected newly identified requirements, and that the overall financial balance was preserved. Should the work programme be modified, the budgetary impact would be evaluated and submitted to the Conference for approval.

Subject to that condition, the draft budget had been put to the vote and had been adopted by a majority, with one vote against.

Three proposals had been submitted for amendments to the wording of section 2 of the report. In the second subparagraph on staff expenditure, a new sentence should be inserted: "Consistent with prior agreement, the new IHO structure will not entail budget increases". The second and third proposals related to the first sentence of the penultimate subparagraph, in which the word "forecasted" should be deleted and replaced by "which had been established through the 1982 International Hydrographic Conference". The following wording should be added after "contributions": "for the Fund, plus an added amount of about €45 000 for long-distance travel in support of capacity building".

Rear Admiral ANDREASEN (United States of America) recalled that on the first day of the Conference, during consideration of the table of tonnages, his delegation had requested that the proposed five-year budget be brought into conformity with the tonnage adopted. His delegation had requested that the final number of shares be increased from 670 to 673, and that the unit share value be reduced by about €18. His delegation objected to document CONF.17/F/02 Rev.3, in which the number of shares had been increased to 673 but the unit share value was held at the same level. That resulted in an annual increase of about €12 000 in total proposed contributions from Member States, or €60 000 for the five-year period, without any change in the proposed work programme. He requested that the unit share value be decreased. The totals would then be those given in CONF.17/F/02 Rev.2, which were the amounts originally proposed to support the work programme for 2008-2012.

The PRESIDENT OF THE DIRECTING COMMITTEE said that two communications received just before the meeting of the Finance Committee had resulted in a net increase of three shares, corresponding to an increase in the budget of about €11 500. In view of the late arrival of the notifications, it had been decided to place that amount in the annual surplus, which, with the agreement of Member States, was either used to supplement the Internal Retirement Fund or transferred to the Operating Cash Reserve. The Directing Committee had been concerned that if it decreased the share value by €18, any subsequent change in tonnage in the near future would mean that the contribution would have to be increased by a few euros. A change in the number of shares could be considered when the annual budget was submitted to Member States.

Rear Admiral ANDREASEN (United States of America) said that in the experience of his delegation, an adjustment of share numbers late in the Conference was disruptive in their planning for the Conference. They were also concerned that, as one-third of the seats on the Council would be occupied by the 10 States with the highest tonnage, States might decide to increase their fleet marginally in order to gain a seat on the Council. He therefore requested that the Organization respect Article 6 of its Financial Regulations, whereby tonnage was to be notified 2 months before the Conference. No changes such as those recently introduced by Cuba, the Republic of Korea and the United Kingdom, could be made subsequent to that date.

Mr. SPITTAL (New Zealand), recalling the United Kingdom had declared 10 million tonnes in excess of their actual tonnage, asked how such a situation would be handled, if a Member State could not change the tonnage figure submitted 2 months previously.

Rear Admiral ANDREASEN (United States of America) said that if the tonnage notified by the United Kingdom had been reduced by 10 million tonnes and had resulted in a decrease in the number of shares, the Conference would have underfunded the work programme it had itself adopted.

Rear Admiral MONCRIEFF (United Kingdom) remarked that the change in tonnage his country had submitted did not change its number of votes or its contributions, since the contribution of a Member State with a tonnage greater than 29 million tonnes did not change with any additional increase. His delegation had clarified the figure only to show where his country would rank on the table of tonnages.

Rear Admiral ANDREASEN (United States of America) agreed that the change submitted by the United Kingdom had had no effect on the budget. However, if such a change did reduce the budget, the Conference would have to accept a lower budget while maintaining the work programme.

Commander KLEPSVIK (Norway) pointed out that the IHB approach ensured a degree of security in the event of non-payment of contributions. Although there had been an increase in the number of shares over the past five years, that might not always be the case. He agreed with the United States that reporting of tonnage should be re-evaluated, as the fluctuations in the reporting of tonnage over the past few months had not been foreseen.

The PRESIDENT OF THE DIRECTING COMMITTEE said that the Directing Committee would consider the comments made and make a proposal to Member States concerning the setting of future budgets.

On that understanding, the IHO five-year budget 2008-2012 was approved.

IHO budget for 2008 (CONF.17/F/03 rev.1)

Mr. MAIDMENT (United Kingdom), Vice-Chairman of the Finance Committee, introducing the IHO budget for 2008, said that it was a sub-set of the five-year budget. All the points just mentioned therefore applied to the budget for 2008.

The budget for 2008 was approved.

Report of the Working Group on the salary scheme of the Secretary General and of the Directors under the new structure of the IHO (CONF.17/F/04 rev.1 and CONF.17/F/05)

Mr. MAIDMENT (United Kingdom), Vice-Chairman of the Finance Committee, introducing section 4, explained the consequences of the adoption of the United Nations pay structure for all IHO salaries. Whereas in 2003 the Working Group had proposed that the pay rate be aligned when individuals were recruited, and their salaries updated in the intervening years by applying Monaco civil service inflation factors, the United Nations post adjustment factors would now be applied instead. Job descriptions had not been established for the Secretary General and the Directors. Once that had been done, an independent consultancy firm, Global Consulting Services (GCS), which had previously reviewed IHO posts and their gradings, would be asked to review the new job descriptions and confirm their alignment with the United Nations salary scale.

The report was approved.

Reappointment of the external auditor

After an introduction by Mr. MAIDMENT (United Kingdom), Vice-Chairman of the Finance Committee, the PRESIDENT asked whether there was any objection to the re-appointment of Cabinet Morel as external auditor.

There being none, the proposal was endorsed.

The Finance Committee Report as a whole, as amended, was approved.

REPORT OF THE ELIGIBILITY COMMITTEE (CONF.17/E/REP) (Agenda item 7)

Rear Admiral RAO (India), Chairman of the Eligibility Committee, said that the Committee, after scrutinizing the statements of service of the candidates nominated for election to the Directing Committee of the IHB, had concluded unanimously that all six candidates were eligible. The Committee therefore recommended that they be confirmed as eligible for election to the Directing Committee for the period 2007–2012.

The report of the Eligibility Committee (CONF.17/E/REP) was adopted.

OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business.

Rapporteur : Mr. Sean HINDS (Canada)

CONTENTS

- Election of Directors (Agenda item 8)
 - Closing Ceremony (Agenda item 10)
 - Date of the next Conference
 - Seating order at the next Conference
 - Presentation of prize for IHO Chart Exhibition
 - Statements by outgoing and incoming Directors
 - Closing remarks by the President of the Conference
-

**ELECTION OF THE DIRECTING COMMITTEE 2008-2012
(Ref. Doc. IHO M-1) (Agenda item 8)**

The PRESIDENT explained the procedure to be followed for the election of the Directing Committee, which was based on the relevant provisions of the Convention, the General Regulations and the Rules of Procedure. He intended to hold the three ballots for Directors, and the ballot for President, in closed session and would then reopen the session in order to inform the Conference of the names of those who had been elected.

All delegates who were not entitled to vote, and observers, should leave the hall.

The PRESIDENT said that 70 delegations would be voting.

A first vote was taken by secret ballot.

The result of the vote was as follows:

Number of votes received by each candidate:

Commodore (Retd.) Joe ABULU (Nigeria)	6 votes
Captain Hugo GORZIGLIA (Chile)	48 votes
Commander Frode KLEPSVIK (Norway)	39 votes
Vice Admiral Alexandros MARATOS (Greece)	129 votes
Dr. Hideo NISHIDA (Japan)	36 votes
Captain Robert WARD (Australia)	28 votes

Vice Admiral Alexandros MARATOS (Greece) was therefore elected a member of the new Directing Committee.

A second vote was taken by secret ballot.

The result of the vote was as follows:

Number of votes received by each candidate:

Commodore (Retd.) Joe ABULU (Nigeria)	4 votes
Captain Hugo GORZIGLIA (Chile)	148 votes
Commander Frode KLEPSVIK (Norway)	49 votes
Dr. Hideo NISHIDA (Japan)	47 votes
Captain Robert WARD (Australia)	38 votes

Captain Hugo GORZIGLIA (Chile) was therefore elected a member of the new Directing Committee.

The PRESIDENT said that 69 delegations would be voting in the third ballot.

A third vote was taken by secret ballot.

The result of the vote was as follows:

Number of votes received by each candidate:

Commodore (Retd.) Joe ABULU (Nigeria)	4 votes
Commander Frode KLEPSVIK (Norway)	92 votes
Dr. Hideo NISHIDA (Japan)	69 votes
Captain Robert WARD (Australia)	119 votes

Captain Robert WARD (Australia) was therefore elected a member of the new Directing Committee.

The PRESIDENT invited the heads of delegation to elect the President of the new Directing Committee.

A vote to elect the President of the Directing Committee was taken by secret ballot.

The result of the vote was as follows:

Number of votes received by each candidate:

Captain Hugo GORZIGLIA (Chile)	55 votes
Vice Admiral Alexandros MARATOS (Greece)	185 votes
Captain Robert WARD (Australia)	39 votes

Rear Admiral Alexandros MARATOS was therefore elected President of the new Directing Committee.

Delegates and observers resumed their seats in the Hall.

The PRESIDENT announced the composition of the new Directing Committee, offered the congratulations of the Conference to the new team and wished them every success in their work. He invited the newly elected Directors to take up their duties on 1 September 2007.

CLOSING CEREMONY (Agenda item 10)**DATE OF THE NEXT CONFERENCE**

The PRESIDENT OF THE DIRECTING COMMITTEE said that the first or second week in May or the first week of June 2009 would be possible dates for the next Conference.

Following a show of hands, the PRESIDENT proposed that the 4th Extraordinary International Hydrographic Conference should be held in the first week of June 2009.

It was so agreed.

SEATING ORDER AT THE NEXT CONFERENCE

The letter “**W**” was drawn, and the PRESIDENT noted that South Africa, being the first country to appear after the letter “W” in the French alphabetical list of country names, would be the first in the seating order in 2009.

PRESENTATION OF PRIZE FOR CHART EXHIBITION

Rear Admiral BARBOR (Director IHB), speaking on behalf of the panel of judges, specially commended Tunisia’s chart exhibit, the first chart, moreover in Electronic Navigational Chart (ENC) format, to be published by Tunisia’s national offices.

The exhibit by Australia had been ranked third and the exhibit by The Netherlands second. The panel had chosen the exhibit by the United States, commemorating the 200th anniversary of the founding of the Office of Coast Survey, as the overall winner.

The PRESIDENT OF THE DIRECTING COMMITTEE presented the award to the Head of the United States delegation.

Applause.

STATEMENTS BY OUTGOING AND INCOMING DIRECTORS

Rear Admiral BARBOR congratulated the new Directing Committee on their election. Describing the XVIIth Conference as successful and productive, he said that the decisions taken and resolutions adopted would be critical to the current operations and future governance of the Organization. On their own the resolutions carried little weight; maximum effort was needed from all concerned, individually and collectively, to turn them into reality. He thanked the Member States for their hospitality, and the Government of the Principality of Monaco for its personal and professional support. He praised the staff of the IHB for their hard work and professionalism, and expressed his gratitude to his fellow Directors. His five-year term of office had been a valuable opportunity to engage in a collective effort to make IHO a better, more productive and more relevant Organization.

Applause.

The PRESIDENT thanked Rear Admiral Barbor for his five years of work on behalf of Member States, and wished him well for the future.

The PRESIDENT OF THE DIRECTING COMMITTEE expressed his gratitude to the Conference for having entrusted him with a second term as President of the Directing Committee. He was honoured by that decision, and he assured the Conference that the new Directing Committee would continue to work to advance the interests of the Organization and its Member States, just as the present

Committee had done for the past five years. There were no winners or losers; all the candidates should be congratulated on their willingness to serve the Organization. Rear Admiral Barbor, who was leaving the team, had worked hard and with great devotion, and he wished to thank him for all he had done for the Organization. He would be replaced by Captain Ward, whose knowledge and experience in the field of hydrography and dedication to the Organization, would doubtless contribute to its continued success.

The success of the Directing Committee, the Bureau and the Organization itself depended on the Member States, and he wished to thank them for their support during the past five years. On a personal note, he also wanted to thank his wife for her support during his first term of office. Finally, he thanked the President of the Conference for his excellent work in leading the Conference, which he believed had been very successful.

Captain GORZIGLIA thanked the Conference for re-electing him. It was both a great honour and a great responsibility for him to be given the opportunity to continue serving the Organization over the next five years. He would endeavour to be worthy of the confidence that Member States had placed in him. He was grateful for the support he had received from his colleagues on the Directing Committee, from Member States and from the staff of the Bureau during his first term. He hoped to capitalize on the experience and knowledge he had gained to fulfill the mission of the Organization in the coming five years. He welcomed Captain Ward to the Directing Committee and offered him his personal support as he took up his new position. In conclusion, he, too, wished to thank his wife and family, with whom he shared the honour that had been bestowed upon him by the Conference.

Captain WARD said that he was honoured to have been chosen to serve Member States and the Organization as a Director. In his new role, he would apply himself with the same enthusiasm and vigour as in the past, and would do his best to help the Organization achieve its aims and objectives.

CLOSURE OF THE CONFERENCE

Dr. ESTIRI (Islamic Republic of Iran), Captain BARNUM (United States of America) and Mr. ALHAMMADI (Bahrain) presented gifts to the IHB.

Professor EHLERS (Germany), speaking on behalf of the Conference participants, congratulated the President on the calm, efficient and good-humoured manner in which he had steered the Conference to a successful conclusion, and presented him with a gift. He added that IHO had made significant progress and was of great importance to the hydrographic community, but there was still much to be done to modernize the Organization to meet future challenges.

The PRESIDENT OF THE DIRECTING COMMITTEE also presented gifts to the President and Vice-President of the Conference with a special ceremonial gavel to the President.

Following the customary exchange of courtesies, the PRESIDENT declared the XVIIth International Hydrographic Conference closed.
