

RENC Harmonisation Sub Group 2 (RHSG2) – Minutes of meeting

13th May, 10:00-12:00, IHB Offices, Monaco

1. List of participants

Member States and RENCs:

Chair – Captain Peter Kortenoeven - (Chair IC-ENC SC)	PK
Mr NG Kwok Chu – Hong Kong – EAHC	KC
Mr Keith Packer – UKHO – IC-ENC Operator	KP
Mr Evert Flier – NHS Primar Operator	EF
Mr Hans Christoffer Lauritzen - Director PRIMAR	HCL
Mr James Harper – General Manager IC-ENC	JH
Mr Nick Ligacs – Manager IC-ENC Australia	NL
Ing en Chef Yves Guillam – France	YG
Mr Sean Hinds – Canada	SH
Mr Juha Korhonen – Finland	JK
Cdr Paolo Lusiani – Italy	PL
Dr Tatsuo Komori - Japan	TKo
Mr Teruo Kanazawa – Japan	TKa

IHO Secretariat

Mr Robert Ward – IHB President	RW
Mr Mustafa Iptes - IHB Director	MI
Mr Gilles Bessero - IHB Director	GB

Opening Remarks & Adoption of Agenda

2. Chair opened the meeting and invited IHB to address attendees. RW welcomed attendees to the meeting. He reminded all that it is critical to consider the ENC users when holding discussion on ENC quality and distribution issues.

3. The agenda was agreed as follows:
 1. Welcome and Introductions
 2. Adoption of RHSG1 minutes
 3. Review of actions from RHSG
 4. Discussion on progress made, including:
 - 4.1 Update on IC-ENC / PRIMAR Cooperation Programme
 - 4.2 EAHC Regional Co-ordinating Centre for ENCs (Mr NG Kwok Chu)
 - 4.3 IHO RENC model options
 - 4.4 Barriers to RENC membership
 5. Summary and work plan
 6. Agree report to WENDWG3
 7. AoB

Welcome and Introductions

4. Each attendee introduced themselves and their organisation.

Adoption of RHSG1 minutes

5. The RHSG1 Draft minutes were circulated to the attendees in Jan 2013. Several attendees commented that the minutes had not been received. JH informed meeting that IHB have agreed to a RHSG area on the IHO website for meeting documents. The minutes (and any other relevant meeting documents) to be uploaded here, reviewed by all, and endorsed. RHSG2 minutes to be loaded here too.
6. ACTION RHSG2_1: JH to ensure all meeting documents posted on IHO website site

Review of actions from RHSG1

7. **Action RHSG1_1:** Julia Powell to draft a definition of the minimum level services required to be provided by a RENC and circulate by correspondence to gain group agreement before submission through the WEND by correspondence to the IRCC for endorsement in June 2013 and potential publication by CL or inclusion in S-32.

8. Status: Document was completed by Julia Powell and sent to RHSG1 Chair, however not all RHSG attendees have received it. Agreement to the RENC minimum service level will be incorporated into the work of RHSG2 and its subsequent report to WENDWG3 and IRCC.

9. **Action RHSG1_2:** Chairs to submit proposed scope amendment of the RHSG through the WEND by correspondence to the IRCC for endorsement in June 2013.

10. Note, scope amended to: "To develop the most appropriate RENC structure for the IHO to achieve the WEND vision.". Status: Ongoing. To be addressed in RHSG2 report to WENDWG3, for endorsement at IRCC5 in June 2013.

11. **Action RHSG1_3:** ICENC (Rod Nairn) and PRIMAR develop a concept document to define this entity by 31 Dec 2012.

12. Status: Not achieved; IHO/RENC informal discussions were held earlier in the day to establish the IHB position regarding developing the RENC concept. The output from this will be briefed at agenda item 4.3 and used to develop the concept document.

13. (Note: No action RHSG1_4)

14. **Action RHSG1_5:** ICENC SC Chair / ICENC Operator and PRIMAR Advisory Committee Chair / PRIMAR Operator seek in-principle agreement from their committees to the formation of an IHO RENC - by end 2012.

15. Status: Complete. IC-ENC Steering Committee and PRIMAR Advisory Committee have confirmed agreement to the principle.

16. **Action RHSG1_6:** RHSG ongoing work - to develop a proposal on the IHO RENC Concept to Member States for endorsement at the next Extraordinary International Hydrographic Conference in 2014.

17. Status: Ongoing. The plan is to agree at RHSG2 the milestones required to achieve the proposal to be considered by the EIHC in October 2014.

Discussion on progress made

Update on IC-ENC / PRIMAR Cooperation Programme

18. HCL briefed the meeting on the progress made between the two existing RENCs over the six months since RHSG1, as follows:

19. Membership

- a. Iran and Georgia have joined PRIMAR
- b. Italy declared intention to join a RENC – considering options of PRIMAR, IC-ENC, or joint membership

20. Change of key personnel:

- a. RENC Governance Board Chairmen have changed:
Chair of IC-ENC Steering Committee Capt Peter Kortenoeven, NL
Chair of PRIMAR Advisory Committee Mr Tõnis Siilanus, EE
- b. IC-ENC Host HO Hydrographers have changed:
UKHO: Rear Adm Tom Karsten
AHS: Cdre Brett Brace

21. Joint RENC presentation to ROPME Sea Area RHC, Saudi Arabia

- a. Well received, constructive question and answer session
- b. Action to approach each RHC to offer similar presentation

22. Commercial

- a. Launch of the new Joint RENC ENC licensing terms and conditions on 1st Jan 13. 39 HOs using this model. Description document provided to WENDWG for wider distribution

23. Technical

- a. Error information exchange and joint testing of validation software continues
- b. RENC overlap policy drafted
- c. Policy for scheduled ENC cancellation/replacement being developed

- d. Join Technical Experts WG meeting in June:
 - i. Presentations from industry
 - ii. S101 preparation workshops

EAHC Regional ENC Co-ordinating Centre (RECC)

24. KC briefed the meeting on developments within the EAHC region with respect to a future RECC. He commented that this was discussed at meeting in January and the EAHC agreed to form the RECC and the HOs in the region are now considering the model that will best suit their needs. The focus is on ensuring ENC quality through regional harmonisation of data content, and agreement on coverage to resolve/prevent overlaps and gaps. JH confirmed that IC-ENC and PRIMAR will be able to assist with their experiences and 'lessons learned' if this is required by the EAHC. KC thanked the RENCs for the kind offer and will be in touch with them in due course.

IHO RENC model options

25. PK then briefed the meeting on the outcomes of the IHB/RENC informal discussions held earlier in the day, attended by the three IHB Directors, RENC Operators, RENC Managers and PK, informing the meeting that this is the right time to consider a new strategic direction for the future of RENCs and the WEND. This could be achieved by giving RENCs a clear status within the IHO structure, and dispelling mis-perceptions that the RENCs are in place to either alter data or to make money.
26. PK continued that one option could be for the RENCs to be part of the secretariat, but at all times ensuring that any RENC activity undertaken under the IHB is budget neutral. He highlighted the main outcomes of the workshop as being that the IHO could provide a new board of governance that would oversee the activities of the existing and future RENC organisations, with a focus on data quality and the power to audit and approve RENC office quality procedures. All activities of the board would be clear and transparent, and the board would also include the RENC Operating HOs to ensure that prescribed RENC activities are compatible with the liability risk these HOs may be exposed to via operating a RENC office.
27. EF confirmed that this approach would be working towards the WEND vision. YG added that considering the experience of the PRIMAR Strategy Group, the focus now should be on generating the IHO-RENC concept model in greater detail.
28. RW stated that this summary reflected the earlier informal discussions and that the Directing Committee are in full support of these developing these proposals further. In his opinion they form an important next step towards fully achieving the WEND concept, however the proposals must of course be approved by the IHO Member States.

29. RW continued that this approach would give the IHO an element of ownership over the existing and future RENCs, and that RENCs would have a greater level of credibility and official status with in IHO. He confirmed that the IHO Convention would not need to be amended to cater for any new status for RENCs, and that if a new model requires the IHB to appoint service providers to deliver any or all of the RENC services, then this is already covered by existing regulations. RW stressed that all RENC activities that might be undertaken on behalf of the IHO and its Member States must be self supporting since IHO Member states would be unlikely to approve a proposal otherwise.
30. RW concluded by summarising that the envisaged infrastructure and governance requirements are feasible. The biggest challenge now is to document the proposal and then communicate it to the Member States.
31. SH asked whether the addition governance level could potentially hamper the responsiveness of RENCs to user demands and commercial innovations. The example of Pay As You Sail licensing terms was used as an example of existing responsiveness, with Member States supporting the principle and the RENC policies being developed in a relatively timely manner compared to decision-making in other inter-governmental organizations.
32. RW commented that from his perspective the current system was sufficient and the new approach would not detract from it; Member States will also still be free to react at a national level.
33. YG added that that from his perspective as a PRIMAR member, the decision making process was adequate and he supported the concept of greater involvement in the RENC decision making process by the IHO.
34. JH commented that IC-ENC has recently reviewed its governance and decision making rules, and has reviewed options for efficient decision making now that there are 28 nations involved. Future RENC governance must be agile enough to respond quickly to developments in the industry.

Barriers to RENC membership

35. JH presented the list of seven 'Barriers to RENC membership' as recorded at RHSG1, with a view to establishing how critical they are, and thus whether or not they form essential components of a single IHO-RENC model. These are:
 - a. Not meeting nationally required turn around times for data verification
 - b. Not providing full services 365 days per year
 - c. Perceived loss of ability to control who the ENC data is distributed to
 - d. Perceived loss of control over the limits/extent and coverage of National ENC
 - e. Fear of data Piracy or under-reporting of ENC sales to the producer nation
 - f. National concern that a RENC may withdraw data if not considered up to date
 - g. National HO not having the authority to sign an agreement with a RENC.

36. Considering points a and b, the attendees recollected that these were requirements stated by the NOAA representative at RHSG1, who was not present to expand on the issues at this meeting. However, the meeting discussed various aspects of 24/7/365 service delivery, and noted:
- Some End User Service Providers currently offer round the clock global support to mariners navigating on ENC's
 - It may be sufficient for a RENC to offer a help-desk function 24 hours a day, as opposed to a full RENC service
 - ENC cells or updates should be available as soon as possible to end users once deemed fit for release by the producing HO.
 - Although each HO will require differing maximum response times from its RENC, any IHO-RENC model should cater for these requirements.
37. Points c, d, e and f were recognized by the meeting as referring to perceptions of RENCs, and may not necessarily reflect reality. EF commented that now that the EAHC is considering its ENC co-ordinating options, maybe even the term 'RENC' is a problem, and evokes feelings instead of facts. KC responded that perceptions are based on more than just feelings, and it is a fact that a significant number of HOs have not joined a RENC...these HOs need a guarantee of what happens to their data once it enters a RENC. He reiterated that the drive of the possible EAHC RECC will be ENC data quality and harmonization, simply using validation software could not assure the ENC's are good enough for users.
38. RW described his understanding of the IMO position and his involvement with other ENC/ECDIS stakeholders; while regional ENC quality is undoubtedly a high priority, it is coverage and availability of the ENC data that is forming the majority of user comment on ENC navigation. HCL confirmed that ENC distribution is an important aspect.
39. The meeting discussed point g, which included the concept of an HO automatically becoming a member of the IHO-RENC by virtue of being an IHO Member State. The meeting acknowledged that each HO has a unique position and level of autonomy within its country's government structure, and formally joining any type of organization may require approval from several other levels.
40. KP summarized the points a-g above and posed the question to RHSG2 of whether or not setting up IHO-RENC would address each of the concerns/barriers to entry. RW responded that appropriate Terms of Reference could address these issues. PK confirmed that each issue will be considered as the IHO-RENC model develops, in order to give guarantees to each of the contributing member nations and make nations happy to provide their data. HCL added that an IHO 'seal of approval' of RENC operations will assist with this too.
41. SH commented that each HO is a member of the IHO via the Convention, but may have varying levels of quasi-legal relationships / Memorandums of Understanding with different service providers. He enquired about the likely

legal position of IHO-RENC. PK replied that the legal position will be kept as simple as possible to avoid complications, and acknowledged the important point of making the position clear in the IHO-RENC model document.

42. JH then summarized the remaining discussion points from the IHB/RENCs earlier informal discussions. The discussion topics and summary of conclusions are included at Annex A.

Summary and work plan

43. PK thanked all attendees for their input into the meeting and acknowledged that the IHO-RENC model needs to be developed further, and this will require the input from the RHSG and WENDWG participants.
44. PK proposed that a small working group be formed to develop a short and simple model description, that is easily understood and addresses the key issues highlighted today. This was agreed, with the composition as follows:
- a. PK – to represent IC-ENC Steering Committee
 - b. YG – to represent PRIMAR Advisory Committee
 - c. JH – to represent IC-ENC RENC
 - d. HCL – to represent PRIMAR RENC
 - e. IHB Directing Committee

Agree report to WENDWG3

45. PK proposed that the small working group (minus IHB Directing Committee) convene in the evening in order to develop an initial draft of the IHO-RENC concept for discussion at WENDWG3. This was agreed.
46. ACTION RHSG2_2: Working Group to develop IHO-RENC concept discussion paper for review at WENDWG3 on 14th May 2013.
47. Post meeting note:
The Working Group met and presented their outcomes to WENDWG3. Following discussion, the Working Group will now produce a short and concise description of how RENCs might work under an “IHO-RENC” Management Board, as well as terms of reference of this board. The Group will meet twice during June 2013, and after each meeting circulate their work to the WENDWG3 participants for comment. The aim is for this work to be complete and available for wider distribution/discussion **by 1st July 2013**.

Any Other Business

48. NL offered his support to the working group, which was welcomed.

Meeting closed at 12:00

Annex A IHB/RENCs informal discussions - discussion topics and summary of conclusions

IHB / RENCs meeting

09:00-10:00 13th May 2013 IHB Offices

Present: Robert Ward, Mustafa Iptes, Gilles Bessero, Peter Kortenoeven, Evert Flier, Keith Packer, Hans Lauritzen, James Harper, Nick Ligacs

Goal of workshop is to establish:

- What is the IHO top level vision of ENC production/quality assurance/distribution?
- What is the IHO view on the IHO-RENC concept; what will it do, how will it be organised etc

Issues that will need to be explored include:

- Will IHB be able to provide resources for the initiative, in terms of:
 - Personnel
 - Accommodation / facilities
 - Information Technology

Not at this stage, current model of HOs providing these elements should remain. All three IHB Directors to be involved with developing future model.

- What is the IHB position with respect to financing costs (both start up and ongoing costs)

Any IHB involvement must be cost neutral. With regards to the financial procedures within RENCs, RENCs could use the IHB in whole or in part (this option to be considered during model development).

- What will be the 'legal personality' of the IHO-RENC (and thus there are questions over the liability accepted by IHB)

IHO does have a legal personality and can sign contracts etc, however whether this is an appropriate option to be utilised by the RENC organisation(s) will depend on the agreed IHO-RENC model.

- What options exist for IHB relationships with service providers, e.g. are there procurement rules etc that will need to be considered?

IHB can enter into contracts with other organisations; no prescriptive procurement rules but this will need to be reviewed if IHO-RENC model requires it.

- What will be the governance and decision making process of IHO-RENC; what are the existing IHB rules which will apply (or need to be formally acknowledged as not appropriate)

IHO governance is dictated by the Convention, which is set by members and would need to be adhered to.

- What is the position on ENCs produced by non-IHO Member States

To be considered on a case by case basis

- What can the current RENCs offer the IHB in terms of above

To be defined once the IHO-RENC model is more mature

- What are the goals and milestones, i.e. confirm working towards approval by IHO Member States at EIHC October 2014. What are formal requirements/stages for this?

The goal is for a proposal to be endorsed by IHO Member States at EIHC October 2014 (a yes vote by at least two thirds of those members present). A substantial proposal will need to be submitted to IHB by the end of January 2014, which will need to have come through IRCC (and so will need IRCC approval via correspondence out of committee).