



Worldwide ENC Database Working Group (WEND-WG)

WEND-WG/Letter 01-2013 dated 5 February 2013

Dear RHC Chairs, WEND-WG representatives and other colleagues,

Action WEND-WG2/04

Amplification on the limitations of the lists (WEND-WG 2-11) of Ports not covered by larger scale ENCs.

1. At the WEND-WG2 meeting, in September 2012, the UK presented documents illustrating the restricted ENC coverage available for certain significant ports across all regions. The information was provided by the UKHO in good faith, and reproduced with their consent for illustrative purposes.
2. The WEND-WG2 meeting discussed the general nature of the information provided, identified a number of data quality issues, and suggested several caveats and filters which would enhance the value of the data. IHO encouraged RHC Chairs to offer these initial lists to their respective Regional Hydrographic Commissions, and to report back with detailed observations regarding the scope and content within their regions
3. It is important to understand the provenance and methodology within the original information:
 - i. The port ranking was based on 2006 Lloyds List data using reported deadweight tonnage, and was therefore biased towards container ports and oil/gas/ore bulk terminals, and against ports with significant passenger vessel movements, or with notable traditional dry-cargo traffic. Also there are clear inconsistencies between the detailed data submitted by different port authorities. For instance, certain minor ports, some apparently limited to local fishing vessel activity, appear to rank disproportionately higher than some more significant cruise-ship destinations or off-shore oil/gas terminals. At least one airport freight terminal has now been identified within the initial data. Despite all these inherent inaccuracies, the Lloyd List ranking is the only worldwide ranking which extends beyond the top two or three hundred busiest ports.
 - ii. The recorded port positions were as supplied, without being correlated and corrected to match the charted co-ordinates of each port. In a modest number of cases the recorded co-ordinates have subsequently been found to match a city-centre or administrative facility position.

iii. The parameters for measurement of ENC coverage across the scale bands was not quantified. In essence, the initial documents did not specify the degree of inadequate coverage, whether it was across a single ENC band or across all three larger-scale bands (4, 5 and 6).

iv. The ENC cohort was derived from data held on the UKHO AVCS database, and elsewhere within UKHO records. A small number of ENCs are not currently available through the UKHO AVCS, mainly in the EAHC and MBSHC regions.

v. The coverage offered by ENCs in preparation, from various nations, was not considered.

4. The WEND-WG Chair, together with the UK/UKHO representatives, has been encouraged by the constructive and useful feedback provided, by individual representatives, by WEND WG members, and by RHC's, notably the Baltic Hydrographic Commission.

5. Following WEND-WG2, UKHO has reviewed the information it provided in those initial lists, and is working to further refine the Lloyd List data. UKHO will endeavour to create more a robust analysis of ports with inadequate ENC coverage, notwithstanding the potential commercial sensitivities of such information. Accordingly UKHO would welcome further detailed responses from RHCs, and from IHO member states, on the validity of the initial lists, and on corrections and improvements to that data. These should be communicated directly to the UKHO WEND Secretariat steve.barnett@ukho.gov.uk with a copy to me.

Yours sincerely,



Captain Jamie McMichael-Phillips
WEND-WG Chairman
jamie.mcmichael-phillips@ukho.gov.uk