

# ENC Standards Maintenance Working Group meeting 7

Wellington - New Zealand - Mon 21<sup>st</sup> Nov – Tuesday 22<sup>nd</sup> Nov 2022

## Final Record

NOTE: the following Record is ordered by Agenda Item number and not in the order of Papers as included in the timetable for the meeting (ENCWG7-02.1).

Agenda Items in **red** are Items that are not included in the posted ENCWG7 Agenda and Timetable.

Decision numbers highlighted in **grey**. Action numbers highlighted in **blue**.

Agenda Item	Topic	Presenter
-	Opening welcome NZ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The <b>Hydrographer of New Zealand</b>, Mr Adam Greenland, welcomed participants to the combined 7<sup>th</sup> ENCWG/S-101PT9 meeting. Staff from Toitū Te Whenua Land Information New Zealand then provided a traditional Māori welcome.</li> </ul>	
-	Introductions to the ENCWG <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The <b>ENCWG Chair</b>, Mr Tom Mellor, welcomed all participants to the much anticipated first face to face meeting of the ENCWG for 2 years.</li> <li>He thanked Toitū Te Whenua Land Information New Zealand LINZ for hosting and for the excellent facilities and arrangements that had been put in place to support the meeting.</li> </ul>	Chair
ENCWG7-02.1	Draft Agenda <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The <b>ENCWG Chair</b> tabled the ENCWG Agenda and timetable, which was accepted without amendment. <b>[Decision ENCWG7/02]</b></li> </ul>	Chair
ENCWG7-03.1	Minutes of last meeting & progress on actions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>IHO Sec</b> (Yong Baek) tabled the draft report from the ENCWG6 remote meeting, which was accepted without amendment. <b>[Decision ENCWG7/03]</b></li> <li><b>IHO Sec</b> reported on the progress on actions from NCWG6, stating that most actions had been completed; and summarized remaining 5 ongoing actions (06-3, 06-4, 06-6 and 06-10). <b>ENCWG Members</b> were encouraged to provide any progress on these actions to the IHO Sec <b>[Action ENCWG7/04]</b></li> </ul>	IHO Sec (Yong)
ENCWG7-03.2	Review of HSSC decisions and actions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>IHO Sec</b> (Yong Baek) summarized the HSSC14 decisions and actions affecting ENCWG, in particular the endorsement of UOC Ed 4.3.0, S-58 Ed 7.0.0, and S-65 Annex B Ed 1.0.0. It was noted that HSSC had also approved the development of a NE of S-64 (Agenda 04.3 and 05.1); and remaining actions from HSSC would be covered under Agenda items 03.3, 04.1, 04.9.</li> </ul>	IHO Sec (Yong)
ENCWG7-03.3	ENCWG to propose amendments to its TORs ( <i>HSSC14/42</i> ) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amendments proposed by the <b>ENCWG Chair</b> – new Procedures vii and viii.</li> <li>Concern was raised over the reference to S-101PT, which will require amendment when Ed 2.0.0 of S-101 is published and responsibility for S-101 is moved to the ENCWG. It was decided to remove the reference to S-101PT from Procedure viii. <b>[Actions ENCWG7/07, ENCWG7/08 (Chair)]</b></li> </ul>	Chair
ENCWG7-04.1	IHO S-67 Mariners' Guide to use of ENC data in ECDIS ( <i>HSSC14/40</i> ) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The <b>ENCWG Chair</b> reported that the DQWG has agreed on the proposed way forward as suggested by the ENCWG (consolidation of S-66 and S-67 into a new section 5 within S-66; and a new section 6</li> </ul>	Chair

	<p>for cyber-security guidance). It was noted that the current draft as submitted to the meeting did not include the S-67 information as “Section 5”, however the <b>Chair</b> reported that this will be corrected during finalization of the document.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There was some confusion in the meeting as to the intended Publication number to be assigned to the document. The <b>Chair</b> stated that the intention is to have the finalized document designated as S-67, which will be titled <i>Mariners’ Guide to the Use of ENC Data in ECDIS</i>.</li> <li>- The proposed structure for S-67 <i>Mariners’ Guide to the Use of ENC Data in ECDIS</i> as contained in the draft submitted to ENCWG7 was approved. <b>[Decision ENCWG7/09]</b></li> <li>- As stated in Actin HSSC14/40, the <b>Chair</b> stated that the final draft needs to be ready for HSSC15 (due date 7 weeks before HSSC15). The meeting agreed that a draft version of the document would be submitted to the ENCWG by correspondence for final review 2 weeks before the HSSC15 deadline. A <b>Drafting Group (UK (lead), SE, IEC, PRIMAR, IIC, BR, IHO Sec)</b> was formed to prepare this draft. <b>[Action ENCWG7/10]</b></li> <li>- <b>IHO Sec</b> (Jeff Wootton) recalled previous HSSC Actions from some years ago regarding a future review of S-66, and questioned whether these Actions should be investigated for consideration of the New Edition of S-67. <b>[Action ENCWG7/11]</b></li> <li>- Review of IMO MSC.circ.1503 will also be required to see if there is anything that can be included in S-67, and if there are changes that may impact on this MSC.circ, then IMO will need to be notified. <b>[Action ENCWG7/12]</b></li> <li>- Should S-67 incorporate some information about S-100? The meeting agreed that this is not the time to be doing this. Would likely need to be a separate document.</li> <li>- <b>IC-ENC</b> (Tom Richardson) questioned if the List of flag States and contacts (current S-66 Section 2) should be removed. <b>[Action ENCWG7/13]</b></li> </ul>	
ENCWG7-04.2	<p>Skin Of the Earth (SOE) display issue update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The <b>ENCWG Chair</b> and <b>IHO Sec</b> (Yong Baek) provided a verbal update (no Paper submitted) on this issue.</li> <li>- Survey conducted and confirmed that there were a number of manufacturers (3 OEMs and one not an OEM) that have the same problem. Indication provided by these manufacturers as to how long it would take to rectify the situation and promulgate to vessels. Based on these results, it was proposed that existing procedures with Data Producers and RENCs should remain in place for an extended period of time. <b>[Action ENCWG7/14]</b></li> <li>- Contact will be maintained with affected manufacturers on their progress in promulgating system patches to customers.</li> <li>- <b>IIC</b> (Jonathan Pritchard): Is this overkill? The <b>Chair</b> responded that even though this is only a small number of manufacturers, this is a large part of the market.</li> <li>- The <b>Chair</b> reiterated that although the display may be incorrect the ECDIS Alarms/Indications still operate normally.</li> <li>- Requires an S-58 Check (noting that a Check has already been included in most validation software). <b>DK</b> (Richard Fowle): Needs to be reflected in the UOC, then can go in S-58. <b>[Action ENCWG7/15]</b></li> <li>- <b>IEC</b> (Hannu Pieponnen): If we do this, do we need to update S-64? <b>Chair</b>: Needs to be included in S-64 so that it will be included in S-164; and any future Type Approval will ensure that the system does</li> </ul>	Chair/IHO Sec (Yong)



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Action requested: <b>PRIMAR</b> (Svein Skjaeveland): Is it appropriate to state that this should be implemented for reasons of economy? <b>Chair</b>: Did not think that this was really the point – just that the contours can be created with minimal cartographic intervention.</li> <li>- <b>FI</b> (Mikko Hovi): Noted that the paragraph in the recommendation already exists in S-65 Annex A. It was confirmed that it is only the last sentence and the bullets that are proposed to be added. <b>China MSA</b> suggested that the last bullet was not required and it was pointed out that the first 2 bullets are additionally covered by Validation Checks.</li> <li>- <b>Chair, US</b> and <b>DK</b> supported the recommendation. <b>[Decision ENCWG7/22]</b> <b>[Action ENCWG7/23]</b> <b>[Action ENCWG7/24]</b></li> </ul>	
ENCWG7-04.7 ENCWG7-05.2	<p>Issues with ECDIS Chart1/S-52 clarifications</p> <p>Paper 05.2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>SevenCs</b> (Holger) presented proposals to make changes to ECDIS Chart 1.</li> <li>- <b>IIC</b> (Hannu): Did not think that there was any requirement to do anything. Holger: Did not think the ECDIS Chart 1 properly serves the purpose that it is meant for. <b>[Decision ENCWG7/25]</b></li> </ul> <p>Paper 04.7:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>IEC</b> (Hannu) presented the Paper from ENCWG6 related to Agenda Item ENCWG6-04. Noted that the duplicate M_COVR issue as reported by Holger was also included in this Paper. <b>[Action ENCWG7/26]</b></li> </ul>	S-52 Sub-Group
ENCWG7-04.8 ENCWG7-04.14	<p>S-57 to S-101 Conversion</p> <p>Paper 04.8:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The <b>S-57 to S-101 Conversion Sub-Group Co-Lead</b> (Christian Mouden) presented the report of the Sub-Group, highlighting the publication of S-65 Annex B Edition 1.0.0 in May 2022.</li> <li>- New SG members welcome. <b>[Decision ENCWG7/27]</b></li> <li>- <b>IHO Sec</b> (Jeff) reported on progress in the development of Edition 1.1.0 of S-65 Annex B, which is aligned to the draft Edition 1.1.0 of the S-101 DCEG.</li> <li>- VTC meeting of the Sub-Group is planned for late January /early February 2023.</li> </ul> <p>Paper 04.14:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>ID</b> (Qisthi) gave a presentation on the Indonesian experience in S-57 to S-101 conversion for the S-57 to S-101 Trial Conversion for Malacca/Singapore Straits ENC's project. <b>[Decision ENCWG7/28]</b></li> <li>- It was noted that the conversion process was undertaken using an older version of the S-57 to S-101 Converter and the output was aligned to S-101 FC Edition 1.0.0. <b>[Action ENCWG7/29]</b></li> <li>- <b>IHO Sec</b> (Jeff) commended on the work and findings; and reported that the subsequent publication of S-65 Annex A aligned to later versions of the S-101 DCEG and FC should resolve the findings raised as issues in the report.</li> </ul>	S-57 to S-101 Conversion Sub-Group Leads (Christian/Jonathan)/IHO Sec (Jeff)  ID (Qisthi)
ENCWG7-04.9 ENCWG7-04.11	<p>S-101 to S-57 Conversion (<i>HSSC14/41</i>)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>IHO Sec</b> (Jeff) presented an initial draft document concept for S-101 to S-57 conversion guidance. <b>[Decision ENCWG7/30]</b></li> <li>- It was reported that from the initial work done it was expected that the manual intervention required to convert from S-101 to S-57 would be significantly less than when converting from S-57 to S-101; and as such source database configuration for the “dual-fuel” transition period would likely benefit Data Producers if it was configured to S-101.</li> </ul>	IHO Sec (Jeff)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Development of the guidance document is in the early stages and is ongoing. Expected initial draft estimated to be completed end of first quarter 2023. Anticipated to be ready for submission to HSSC16 (2024) after Sub-Group review.</li> <li>- It was proposed that the document is assigned the IHO Publication number S-65 Annex C. <b>[Decision ENCWG7/31]</b> <b>[Action ENCWG7/32]</b></li> </ul>	
ENCWG7-04.10	<p>IHO-SGP lab Project update – S-57 input data, Conversion Tools, S-101 ed 1.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The <b>S-57 to S-101 Conversion Sub-Group Co-Lead</b> (Jonathan Pritchard) reported that the main issue with the project is resources (hardware/software; people; test data). <b>[Action ENCWG7/33]</b></li> <li>- He further reported that he will be holding discussions with Parry Oui (IHO-Singapore Lab General Manager) next week to discuss the process, resources, objectives and project plan.</li> </ul>	S-57 to S-101 Conversion Sub-Group Co-Lead (Jonathan)
ENCWG7-04.12	<p>S-57 UOC changes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Nothing significant to report. See also Agenda Item 04.4.</li> </ul>	IHO Sec (Jeff)
ENCWG7-04.13	<p>S-58 issues updates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The <b>Vice-chair</b> (Richard) reported on changes to the S-58 TDS resulting from publication of S-58 Edition 7.0.0. A couple of minor issues are yet to be addressed. All ENCWG members are welcome to have a look at the revised TDS and supply any feedback. <b>[Action ENCWG7/34]</b></li> <li>- See also Agenda Item 05.5.</li> </ul>	Vice-chair (Richard)
ENCWG7-04.15	<p>S-62 Update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>IHO Sec</b> (Jeff) provided a verbal report on the status of S-62, including a summary of the revised management processes for maintaining the S-62 Data Producer Codes since the migration to the IHO GI Registry, Producer Code Register has been completed.</li> <li>- It was requested that for downloading the Data Producer Codes from the Register, a more machine-readable format could be made available. <b>[Action ENCWG7/35]</b></li> <li>- Further to this request, it was suggested that in the future a portal (URL?) for direct download of the Data Producer Codes into the end-user system could be developed. <b>[Action ENCWG7/36]</b></li> </ul>	IHO Sec (Jeff)
ENCWG7-04.16	<p>S-63 Update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>IIC</b> (Jonathan) presented specifically on the purpose and future of S-63 Appendix 1 – <i>S-63 Test Dataset</i>. Focus was on the relationship between Appendix 1 and S-64 and the future relationship to S-164. It was proposed that a Clarification version of S-63 is produced to specify that Appendix 1 to relate only to those tests which are not duplicated in S-64; and remove all references to the former DPSWG.</li> <li>- The WG agreed that no Clarification version of S-63 was required at this time. <b>[Decision ENCWG7/37]</b></li> <li>- The future of the “Part of S-63 Appendix 1” document - <i>Test Data Implementation Guide</i> (2004) was discussed, with the WG agreeing that this document should be reviewed. <b>[Action ENCWG7/38]</b></li> </ul>	IIC (Jonathan)
ENCWG7-05.3	<p>Dangerous Cargo Berths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>NL</b> (Herman) reported that there is currently no encoding guidance for dangerous cargo berths in S-57 and S-101. <b>[Decision ENCWG7/39]</b> <b>[Action ENCWG7/40]</b></li> <li>- <b>IC-ENC</b> (Tom): Noted that S-131 includes much more detailed information; and utilizes the attribute categoryOfCargo to do this. <b>[Action ENCWG7/41]</b></li> </ul>	NL (Herman)
ENCWG7-05.4	<p>Transporter Bridge Clearance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>IC-ENC</b> (Tom) presented on the confusion that exists for the encoding of the vertical clearance attributes for transporter (and some other) type of bridge.</li> </ul>	IC-ENC (Tom)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It was noted that there are only a little more than 30 of these bridges in the world.</li> <li>- The proposal was that the height of the bridge gantry should be populated in VERCOP and the moving transporter platform height in VERCCL. Concern was raised that this may not be understood by the mariner, with the alternative proposed that these bridges should be encoded as fixed bridges. <b>[Decision ENCWG7/42]</b> <b>[Action ENCWG7/43]</b> <b>[Action ENCWG7/44]</b></li> </ul>	
ENCWG7-05.5	<p>RCID Reuse Clarification</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>IC-ENC</b> (Tom) reported that this issue had resulted in datasets not loading in ECDIS and therefore mitigating action was required, citing clarification to the S-57 Main document, Part 3, clause 2.2. <b>[Decision ENCWG7/45]</b> <b>[Action ENCWG7/46]</b></li> <li>- <b>IEC</b> (Hannu): Suggested that the S-58 Check 3 needed to be amended to clarify that the Check applies to the Base dataset and all its updates (that is, within a single Edition of the dataset). <b>[Action ENCWG7/47]</b></li> <li>- <b>FR</b> (Christian): Would be a burden as Producers would need to check all Updates against the base cell and all previous Updates.</li> <li>- <b>T-Caris</b> (Hugh Astel): Noted that it is the concatenation of RCNM and RCID (subfield NAME) that has to be unique.</li> <li>- It was further determined that this issue will need to be reported to the S-100WG as it may need to be reflected in S-100 Part 10a. <b>[Action ENCWG7/48]</b></li> </ul>	IC-ENC (Tom)
ENCWG7-05.6	<p>Comments on S-65 Annex A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>UK</b> (Andrew Richardson) presented on the proposed clarifications required to S-65 Annex A and the accompanying redline of the document.</li> <li>- Item 2: Needs to clarify that ZOC B needs to be complete seafloor coverage (“high-level” ZOC B).</li> <li>- Item 3: <b>IHO Sec</b> (Jeff): Difficult to put in the changes in context from the presentation given that the entire paragraph is not included. <b>[Action ENCWG7/49]</b></li> <li>- The amended redline proposed changes were submitted to the WG on the final day of the meeting. Changes approved. <b>[Decision ENCWG7/50]</b> <b>[Action ENCWG7/51]</b></li> </ul>	UK (Andrew)
ENCWG7-05.7	<p>Light Sector Encoding Proposal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>UK</b> (Andrew) presented on the issue of long light sectors that may be visible to mariners not displaying in ECDIS when the ENC containing the light is not included in the SENC or the cell is not included in the displayed data. He reported that this may impact on ENC cell scheming and proposed two possible work-arounds to resolve the issue until a more technical solution can be determined.</li> <li>- The Paper generated a lot of discussion. It was suggested that if proper voyage planning was undertaken all datasets relevant to the voyage, including datasets containing aids to navigation that could impact the voyage, would be provided as part of the service provision. It was also noted that there was currently an open Portrayal GitHub issue where discussions were taking place.</li> <li>- <b>IHO Sec</b> (Jeff) raised the ENC scheming currently being discussed within the WENDWG as part of the implementation of the WEND100 Principles.</li> <li>- <b>FR</b> (Christian) stated their preference for Option 1 – do nothing at this time, which was the general feeling of the meeting given the open GitHub issue. <b>[Decision ENCWG7/52]</b></li> </ul>	UK (Andrew)
ENCWG7-05.8	<p>MSC.530(106) and S-61</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The <b>Chair</b> reported on discussions with the IHO Secretariat on a question that had been passed on as a result on the drafting of the</li> </ul>	

	<p>new IMO Resolution MSC. 530(106) relating to the revision of the ECDIS Performance Standards to recognize S-100 within SOLAS carriage requirement regulations. The enquiry was from the IMO Drafting Group and related to clauses within the draft Resolution that reference Raster Charts and the RCDS Mode. While it was agreed that the clauses were erroneously retained in the draft and could therefore be removed, the retention of the text at Annex A of S-61 - <i>Product Specification for Raster Navigational Charts (RNC)</i> (1<sup>st</sup> Edition, January 1999), which is a direct copy of Appendix 7 of the ECDIS Performance Standard (at that time) was questioned.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It was determined that this text should be replaced with a reference only to Appendix 7 of the Resolution. <b>[Action ENCWG7/53]</b></li> </ul>	
ENCWG7-07.1	<p>Date and Venue of next Meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- At the kind invitation of Indonesia, it was agreed that the next meeting of the ENCWG (ENCWG8) would be held in Lombok, Indonesia, in conjunction with the 11<sup>th</sup> meeting of the S-101PT, for the week commencing 25 September 2023. <b>[Decision ENCWG7/54]</b></li> </ul>	Chair