

Paper for Consideration by NCWG

Impact of the Change of Limits between the MACHC and the SWAtHC

Submitted by:	IHO Secretariat, following up on a request from MACHC Chair.
Executive Summary:	This paper submits a global set of proposals, some being in the NCWG remit, following a request received from the MACHC Chair informing the IRCC Chair (and IHO Secretariat) on the change of limits between the MACHC and the SWAtHC.
Related Documents:	S-4; S-11, IHO website > Publications > Standards. MACHC Letter 04/2022 dated 31 March 2022 (in Annex) IRCC14 Decision 12
Related Projects:	Nil

Introduction / Background

1. The MACHC and the SWAtHC have decided to modify their geographical border, moving the existing limit from Latitude 0° to 01°S.
2. As a consequence, the two Regional Hydrographic Commissions have agreed that the limits of the corresponding respective INTERNATIONAL Charting Regions B and C1a need to be aligned with their new areas of responsibility.
3. The impact of this change was assessed by the MACHC, and the Chair of the MACHC invited the IRCC Chair to implement this change as follows:
 - a. Update of the diagram in section A-204.8 of S-4;
 - b. Update of the diagram of the IHO International Charting Regions on the IHO website > Publications > Index of ...> Standards and Specifications > S-11 Part B;
 - c. Update of the MACHC and SWAtHC limits and Charting Regions B and C1a on INTToGIS (S-11 Part B) and the IHO ENC Coverage Catalogue;
 - d. Rewording of section A-204.8 of S-4 to remove the references to the *countries responsible for co-ordinating the international chart schemes in those regions* and removing the names of those countries on the diagram, since the countries acting as Chart Coordinators are subject to change.
4. The IHO Secretariat, on behalf of the IRCC, has agreed to take the lead and follow up on this request.

Discussion / Recommendations

5. With reference to clause A-204.2 of S-4, the IHO Secretariat first checked whether the change of limits had an impact on INT charts numbering:
 - a. It is noted that INT 2003 will now have a coverage that is of a little more significance in Region B than in Region C1a but it is assumed that the 2 regions have already agreed to keep INT 2003 in Region C1a (S-11 Part B, paragraph 3.8.2 refers).
 - b. It is noted that INT 2108 will now have a coverage significantly more important in Region B than in Region C1a. However, it is assumed that the 2 regions have already agreed to keep INT 2108 in Region C1a rather than moving it to Region B (with the need to change the INT chart number such as INT 4198 for instance) (S-11 Part A, paragraph 3.8.2 refers).

6. It is noted that there is no impact on the ENC coverage (and numbering), this area being under the entire charting responsibility of Brazil¹.
7. The limits of the charting Regions B and C1a need to be amended in INTToGIS and in the IHO ENC Coverage Catalogue (Action **IHO Secretariat – In progress²**).
8. On the general diagram of the IHO website showing the coverage of the Regional Hydrographic Commissions, the limit between the MACHC and the SWAtHC needs to be modified, both on small scale and large scale maps (Action **IHO Secretariat - In progress³**).
9. The UKHO, custodian of the English version of S-4, is invited to modify the limit between the Regions B and C1a in A-204.8 in preparation of the next Edition of S-4 (**Action GB**). Meanwhile, the similar diagram available on the IHO website > Publications > Standards > S-11 Part B > International Charting Regions needs to be modified ((Action **IHO Secretariat - Done**)).
10. The tasks allocated to the International Charting Coordination Working Groups in general (See S-11 Part A, Annex I) and assigned to the Regional Coordinators in particular require that this responsibility be assumed for a sufficient period in order to acquire the experience and knowledge of the regional charting situation necessary for an efficient work in support of RHCs. This role allocated to a Member State is therefore not intended to change frequently. However, following the recommendation by the MACHC reported in paragraph 3.d, the IHO Secretariat agrees that S-4, A-204.8 is probably not the best place to keep the list of Regional Coordinators updated. Recently, for example, the MBSHC (for Region F) faced three changes in a short time period.
11. Noting that the IHO website > Publications > Standards > S-11 Part B > INT Charts/ENC Regions Coordinators (as of dd/mm/yyyy) gives more flexibility to keep the list updated, it is proposed to modify A-204.8 as follows:

A-204.8: *The following diagram illustrates the international charting regions, ~~details the countries responsible for co-ordinating the international chart schemes in those regions,~~ and lists the relevant Regional Hydrographic Commissions (if any). **The list of Member States playing the role of Co-ordinators of regional charting schemes is kept updated on the Standards and Specifications page of the IHO web site, under Publication S-11 Part B as document INT Charts/ENC Regions Coordinators.***

Diagram (without any Member States' name)

~~Note: The names of Member States appearing on the diagram are the co-ordinators of the regional charting schemes.~~

12. If and once the proposal at paragraph 11 above is agreed by the NCWG, the recommendation made in paragraph 3.b will be implemented accordingly (Action **IHO Secretariat**).

Conclusions

13. The proposals made by the MACHC in liaison with the SWAtHC, subsequent to the change of the limit between the two RHCs, can be implemented following the analysis presented in paragraphs 5 to 12 above.
14. Some actions can be anticipated before the new Edition of S-4 – which may include other changes – is issued.

Recommendations

15. The NCWG is invited to agree on the way forward and actions as proposed above.
16. For this specific subject, it is recommended that the NCWG endorse the redline changes to S-4 as proposed in paragraph 11 above and to include these changes in the next Edition of S-4.

¹ Except for the ENCs in the « overview » scales produced by the UKHO, but the change of limits has no impact on these ENCs.

² As of 29 August 2022.

³ As of 29 August 2022.

Action Requested of the NCWG

17. The NCWG is invited to:

- 1) **Note** the request given in Annex A (MACHC Letter 04/2022).
- 2) **Endorse** the way forward as proposed by the IHO Secretariat in paragraphs 5 to 12 above.
- 3) **Discuss** and **Approve** the redline amendments to the impacted S-4 clause A-204.8 as proposed in paragraph 11 above when the preparation of a new Edition of S-4 is planned.
- 4) **Initiate** any further action as appropriate.

Annex:

A: MACHC Letter 04/2022 – *Change of the area of coverage of the MACHC.*