

# **6<sup>th</sup> REGION F ICCWG meeting**

Wednesday 25<sup>th</sup> May 2021

VTC Event

10:00 – 12:15

## **MINUTES (9<sup>th</sup> of June)**

*(Paragraph numbering is the same as the Agenda Item numbering. Each Member State participating to the meeting is identified by the two letter country code.)*

<b>ICC6-1</b>	<p><b>Opening of ICCWG-6 meeting</b></p> <p>Chair welcomed all participants (<b>SP, GR, IT, UK, FR, CY, MA, LB, TR, GE, HR, TU, EG</b>) and she noted that despite the difficulties of the past two year, also related to the COVID pandemic, there had been an intense participation of the Member States (MSs) to the Region F ICC WG activities (ENCs and INT Charts production). The Chair remarked which are the peculiarities of the Region F and noted that the 26% of the IHO MSs are members of this Region.</p> <p>The Chair noted that the meeting was structured in a way to enable clarity and transparency and in order to allow anyone to follow the meeting in the best way possible. The Chair informed that a proposed list of actions/recommendation will be showed after each agenda item and also at the end of the meeting. Furthermore, the proposals will circulate by email with a very short deadline (26<sup>th</sup> of May) and they will become part of the RCC Report to the MBSHC22.</p> <p>The Chair provided a short background and overview presentation (ICCWG6-01), in which she noted the significant involvement of MSs. She also highlighted that a significant attention is still payed to INT Chart scheme instead of ENC coverage. In addition, the chair noted that BASWG meeting (11<sup>th</sup> of May - VTC) was an important occasion to update the Regional Charting Coordinator (RCC) on the main issues concerning the area (BASWG minutes preparation on going by BASWG Chair). Finally, the Chair stated that the ICCWG will deal only with technical arguments of discussion and that all procedural aspect will be discussed at the MBSHC22. The agenda was approved and it was adopted without amendments (see ICCWG6-01 and Annex A).</p> <p><i>FR, took the floor to welcome Lebanon (LB) as the newest MBSHC/ICCWG Member State. LB presented itself and explained that there will be an official presentation during the MBSHC meeting.</i></p>
<b>ICC6-2</b>	<p><b>ENC coverage status - ENC overlaps risk assessment</b></p> <p>The Chair provided an <b>update on the evolution of the regional ENC coverage</b> and the outcomes of the RENCs/MSs risk assessment about ENCs overlaps (based on RENCs report). She also provided a detailed presentation (ICCWG6-02) highlighting the status of ENC coverage in the Region F and the “Quality” of the ENCs.</p> <p>The Chair acknowledged the increased production of ENCs by MSs and she noted that there are still noteworthy gaps in the ENC coverage in the Southern and Eastern area of the Mediterranean. Concerned MSs should focus their effort in these areas.</p> <p>The Chair informed the MSs that some investigations are going on with regards to CATZOC U values showed in the INTToGIS system (item pointed out by UA after BASWG15). The Secretariat is taking care of this issue together with the INTToGIS Project Manager and the RENCs, keeping the RCC informed. The RCC will inform UA as soon the checks in the INTToGIS system will be completed.</p>

The Chair informed the MSs that Algeria (DZ) intend to submit a new ENC scheme. She also recommended to UK and DZ to liaise in order to prepare a transition plan for ENC production in the area, also in coordination with the RCC and RENCs.

The Chair acknowledged the MSs effort to liaise and solve **ENC overlaps** and she recalled the main points of the IHO Resolution 1/2018. The results of the increased cooperation between MSs are clear from RENCs Report analysis (.xls file): 115 overlaps were solved in 2021 and 71 in 2019, the number of potential overlaps decreased from 50 to 39 between 2019 and 2021, meaning that MSs liaise to solve overlaps even before the overlaps become “Live”. Furthermore, the Chair mentioned that the number of “Live” overlaps decreased: actually 17 medium risk overlaps assessed by RENCs (24 in 2019). She also noted that the mechanism of ENCs overlap evaluation at the RENCs level is working very well.

The Chair reported to the ICCWG the **“highest” risk overlap cases**. She noted that there is no agreement between GR and TR with regard to the risk assessment for UB2 and UB3 ENC overlaps in the Aegean Sea. GR provided a report about UB2 ENC overlaps that is posted on the web page as item ICCWG6-02A and assessed a “high risk” for safety of navigation in the area. The Chair invited TR to update/confirm its risk assessment (dated 2017) which is currently qualified as a “low risk”. She also provided a technical evaluation and she recommended TR and GR to liaise and solve the overlaps. Finally, she communicated the intention to inform the MBSHC about the situation and that there is no agreement about the risk evaluation (between GR, TR and RENC) and that it is up to the MBSHC to apply Resolution 1/2018.

The Chair highlighted that there are significant overlaps between UA and RF ENC Cells in UB3, UB4, UB5. The Chair provided a technical evaluation taking into account, in particular, the characteristics of the geographical area, the extent of the overlap, the traffic density. The Chair recommended UA and RF to liaise and solve overlaps. She also mentioned that RF was not present at BASWG15 so no update was received on this subject.

Finally, the Chair remarked that the list of **backup of paper charts** was not updated by MSs and that some MSs still have to provide it.

*The Secretariat acknowledged the effort of the Chair in the preparation of the meeting, highlighting that the best use of the INTOGIS system was done. The Secretariat informed that USA (NGA), during MBSHC22, will provide an update about traffic density INTOGIS tool and about the “Port List”. This is something that will be useful in the future to produce ENCs especially in TSS areas where CATZOC values are particular important for safety of navigation (the quality of survey in these areas is also a strategic performance indicator). About the CATZOC values in the Black Sea, the Secretariat confirmed that investigation is ongoing by the Secretariat and communicated that this is probably due to some artifacts causing a misalignment between ENC Catalogue and CATZOC values (investigation on going). Finally, the Secretariat recalled Action IRCC8-13 that invites RHC MSs to define ENC schemes and submit them to the chart coordinator for evaluation together with a transition plan in order to avoid any possible overlaps to be approved during plenary sessions. There are good examples in the past and present of successful ENCs production transitions between MSs that should be reiterated.*

*The Chair noted that coordination between MSs is fundamental and it is expected in the case of the new Algerian scheme (DZ). She also noted that MSs production requirements make necessary to apply the “silence procedure” and not to wait for ICCWG/MBSHC meetings for the approval. The timing is not compatible and for this reason, “smart” solutions should be adopted in compliance with the procedures (Articles 3.7 and 3.8 of the ToRs & RoPs for Region F ICCWG as adopted on July 6<sup>th</sup> 2017).*

*Concerning the ENC risk assessment, GR specified that the criteria used in the in the GR risk assessment report are: geographical location, number of ports and port*

	<p>approaches, size of the area of overlapping, scale of overlapping cells and possible impact on the ECDIS systems, shipping density in the overlapping area which is one of the largest one, data consistency in the overlapping area. All the criteria are in line with the guidelines on assessing and eliminating the risk related to ENC overlaps (WENDWG3). GR provided the historical background about the creation of these overlaps in the area and it informed that it has requested IC-ENC to update its risk assessment about the area that is not acceptable right now. GR recommended requesting the IC-ENC to reassess the risk related to the ENC overlap in the area with the involvement of the concerned parties. GR also recommended that the producer MSs should take responsibility for production and the maintenance of ENCs in line with WEND principles and ENCs guidelines. GR is ready to liaise with all neighbouring Countries to solve/prevent overlaps, provided that they respect the fundamental IHO principle/guidance that “a country is normally the ENC producing country of areas of its national jurisdiction”.</p> <p>GR recommended the application of WEND principles and guidelines about ENCs production and maintenance,. It is within the responsibility of RHC (MBSHC) to examine the capacity and the ability of producing member-states to guarantee the maintenance and updating of ENCs produced in overlapping areas. GR noted that can guarantee the quality maintenance and the updating of its ENCs.</p> <p><b>The Chair</b> noted GR comments and informed that she will recommend to the MBSHC MSs to follow the WEND principles and guidelines with specific regard to the ENC charts production and maintenance responsibilities.</p> <p><b>TR</b> asked to the RCC a clarification with regards the proposed recommendation and actions about the UB2 ENC overlaps between GR and TR, with specific reference to the possible application of the Resolution 1/2018, highlighting that there is no agreement between MSs and RENCs assessment. TR also asked why the applicability of the Resolution was not mentioned for all the nr. 17 “Medium Risk” ENCs, also in consideration that all these overlaps haven’t been solved during the last years.</p> <p><b>The Chair</b> clarified that Resolution 1/2018 does not make any distinction in terms of risk value but only mention “demonstrable risk” assessed by MSs. She also red the proposed action highlighting that in the case of UB2 cells there is a “high risk” evaluated by a concerned MSs and that there is no agreement between MSs and RENCs. The Chair clarified that she will mention all the “highest” risk cases in her report to the MBSHC22 and that is up to the MBSHC to evaluate to apply Resolution 1/2018 in any case of demonstrable risk. She also informed that GR submitted to the RCC a Report with not only technical aspects to be considered.</p> <p><b>TR</b> emphasized that they are keen to cooperate to solve problems but that they had difficulties, also increased by COVID situation.</p> <p><b>GR</b> mentioned some “not technical” aspect related to national jurisdiction and again the importance of the maintenance of charts in accordance with the guidelines and WEND principles. The Chair underlined the “not technical” nature arguments are not of competence of the ICCWG and that the MSBHC22 will be informed about them as the GR report was submitted to the RCC.</p> <p>The <b>IHO Director</b> Luigi Sinapi took the floor and commented about the priorities of the ICC that should be in line with the IRCC ones. He strongly recommended the full implementation of the ENC scheme and being prepared for the S-Ixx transition.</p>
ICC6-3	<p><b>Region F INT scheme status</b></p> <p>The Chair reported on the <b>evolution of the regional INT catalogue</b> and she</p>

acknowledged the effort made by MSs in updating metadata in the INTToGIS and producing new INT charts. In particular, she noted that all the already schemed INT Charts of the Black Sea are produced. This achievement was reached as outcome of the BASWG meeting.

The Chair noted that since 2019 the number of produced INT Charts significantly increased (from 220 to 286). Nr. 76 INT charts are still schemed. She also informed the MSs about the major activities: completion of the Adriatic Sea scheme, accomplishment of the UK-EG transition (example of cooperation and coordination in a production transition), updating activity of metadata.

The Chair also noted the pending activities. She requested to ES an update on Action MBSHC29/37 and the status of the pending INT Chart 3106. About the Aegean INT Chart scheme, she informed the ICCWG that she is going to request for instruction from the MBSHC because the argument is no more at RCC level (technical) due to the arguments provided by the MSs involved after MSBHC21.

Concerning UA-RF pending INT Charts in the Black and Azov Sea, the Chair noted that she did not receive any update at BASWG15 because RF was not present.

Finally, the Chair noted informed the MSs that GE has no more intention to co-produce INT3875 and that exchange of data between MSs for the production of INT3808 (see MBSHC21/34) is expected at the end of 2021.

Concluding the presentation, the Chair made some final consideration about the priorities of the ICCWG and the effort necessary to complete/update the INT charts scheme.

*GR pointed out that usually the plenary meeting is organized before the ICCWG convenes in order to resolve any matter arising from the previous MBSHC meeting and deal with administrative/procedural issues that have effects to the ICCWG work. GR noted that the organizers did not recognize the need to have, as first meeting, the RHC plenary session and also they did not recognized the difficulties of a VTC Meeting. GR reminded its opposition to Decision MBSHC21-03, which was modified by the MBSHC Chair as mentioned in the correspondence exchanged between GR, MSBHC Chair and the IHO Secretariat. In this regard, GR noted that this is a matter to be discussed at the plenary session, and that it is not at technical level. GR also noted that the ICCWG have to move forward somehow and recalled the MBSHC21-03 draft action as it was presented at the end of MBSHC21 meeting.*

*Finally, GR with a good will attitude an in order to give a chance to the MBSHC chair to close this situation for the benefit of the safety of navigation, without prejudice of GR position regarding the promulgation of the Minutes of MBSHC21 Conference, presented a revised proposal containing the 8 INT charts and excluding INT chart 3736. The revised proposal contains the same 8 INT charts already assessed and discussed thoroughly the 5th ICCWG that are in line with ICCWG ToR&RoP. The 8 INT charts solely contain European territory and do not encompass any other coast than the submitting member-state which is Greece and they do not impact any other INT Chart scheme in the area (ICCWG6-03B).*

*The Chair asked GR to share the revised proposal by email to her and the Secretariat. She said that she will inform the MBSHC about this revised proposal but she will also ask for instructions with regard to the Aegean INT Chart Scheme with reference to the outcomes of MBSHC21 meeting.*

*TR highlighted the decision regarding the Aegean INT Chart Scheme is already taken by the MBSHC Chair and it is clear (MBSHC21-03). With regards to GR revised proposal, TR also emphasized that procedures have to be followed and this is not the right moment to submit a proposal and that the MBSHC is not the right place to discuss it. TR point out that there is a decision already in force and ICCWG should take the necessary time to analyze the revised proposal.*

	<p><i>The Chair clarified that she will not make any proposal or recommendation to the MBSHC but she will just inform that there is a revised proposal that will be discussed in the future following the ToR&amp;RoP of the ICCWG/MBSBHC. She also emphasized that the Aegean INT Chart scheme situation is not to be discussed at technical level at the moment and that, as anticipated, instructions are needed from the MBSHC Chair. The Chair also noted that the priority now is to definitely close the situation related to the MBSHC21 meeting about Decision MSBHC21-03 in order to move forward.</i></p> <p><i>GR finally commented that a “revised proposal” is different from a “new proposal” because it is not a new one. GR noted that the nr. 9 INT Charts of the Aegean Sea were submitted in 2019 and they are waiting for a decision from the MBSHC. GR offer is to revise the “proposal” during the MBSHC giving the possibility to the MBSHC Chair to definitely close this pending situation in the Aegean Sea.</i></p>
<b>ICC6-4</b>	<b>Priorities for the ICCWG and new coordinator</b>
	<p>The Chair provided a presentation (ICCWG6-04&amp;05) highlighting some important matters concerning the ICCWG/MBSHC and the MSs in general. She also highlighted that the MBSHC is the largest RHC in terms of number of members and that ICCWG should have a position – at technical level – that covers the needs and expectations of all the MSs. The Chair noted that there is a “wind of change” in cartographic standards and productions and asked if HOs are enough involved in this change also in consideration to the achievement the goals presented in the IHO strategic plan.</p> <p>The Chair noted that in the future it will be more and more difficult for the RCC to take into account all technical needs of the MSs and emphasized that the role of the RCC should be reviewed taking in consideration the sustainability of the work to be done. She also highlighted that all the needs of the MSs should be well represented by the RCC/RHC.</p> <p><i>FR noted the implementation of the IHO strategic plan should be recommended as soon as possible at commission level and that the ICCWG will benefit from this implementation. FR added that ICCWG need guidance on this from the MBSHC.</i></p> <p><i>FR noted that there is more and more interest from privates about e-navigation services and there is a proliferation of products in the market that were supposed to come only from HOs. This is a relevant issue to focus the attention on. On the contrary, the implementation of the INT Chart scheme should not be a priority anymore.</i></p> <p><i>The Chair informed that she will recommend to the MBSHC to provide guidance with regards to the impact of the implementation of the IHO Strategic Plan with regards to the technical work of the ICCWG. She also mentioned that the WEND is working on the new service scheme and that this will be an issue to face at some point.</i></p> <p><i>She also noted that there are many potential competitors of HOs in the market and even if HOs are official products unique producers this is something should not be underestimated.</i></p> <p><i>The Secretariat echoed the Chairs’ words and suggested to recommend to ICC/MBSHC to raise these issues at the next IRCC because they are critically for the implementation of the S-1xx roadmap. The Secretariat underlined that the effort we put on INT Chart scheme determine a lack of resources to move forward also in consideration that there will be not a 1 to 1 relation between S-57 and S-1xx products. The concerns raised by MSs are appreciated but the time has come to move forwards.</i></p> <p><i>The Secretariat recommended that the role of the RCC should be revised and also its name (services should be mentioned).</i></p>

<b>ICC6-5</b>	<b>Region F ICCWG ToRs and RoPs</b>
	<p>The Chair noted that the ToR&amp;RoP should be revised in the future and asked if they are adequate to reach the ICCWG objectives. She noted that some improvement can be made in order to allow the ICCWG to work better.</p> <p><i>The IHO Director remarked that the Region F is characterized by the largest number of MSs with different peculiarities and that it has intrinsic difficulties that are slowing down the activities of the RHC itself. The coordination in this area is not easy and the effect of that is that there are no candidates for the position of the MBSHC vice-chair and RCC. The IHO Director noted that the RHC report to the IRCC15 (structured as a short and effective presentation) will be a good occasion for IRCC to recommend the necessity to revise the role of the RCC in prevision of the new strategic goals of the IHO. He also remarked that thanks to the Resolution 2/1997 it is possible for RHC to easily amend ToR &amp; RoP.</i></p>
<b>ICC6-6</b>	<b>Closure of ICCWG-6 meeting</b>
	<p>The Chair thanked all the participants and explained the reasons of Italy resignation as Region F Charting Coordinator. She also highlighted the challenges of this position highlighting that it is a reasonability but also an honour to work in an international environment such as the ICCWG.</p> <p>FR recalled that they have been the Charting Coordinator of Region F for over 40 years until 2019. The TORs&amp;RoPs were revised in 2017 making reference to the technical nature of IHO work and in particular to the texts relevant to the Charting Coordination. FR calls on the MBSHC Members to apply to take over from Italy as Coordinator.</p> <p>The Chair provided the draft list of actions/recommendations that will be part of the ICCWG Report to the MBSHC22. She also informed the MSs that the list of actions/recommendations will circulate among ICC WG Members the 25th of May prior to be submitted to the MBSHC22.</p> <p>The following Annexes are attached:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. ICC-6 – Agenda</li> <li>B. Report of ICCWG Coordinator to MBSHC (List of Action and Recommendations included)</li> </ul>