

Alberto

From: Hinds, Sean
Sent: mardi 7 août 2012 21:38
To: McMichael-Phillips Jamie
Cc: 'Mike.Prince@defence.gov.au'; 'albuquerque@dhn.mar.mil.br'; 'hydrosan@iafrica.com'; 'los@omantel.net.om'; 'inho@dataone.in'; 'yves.guillam@shom.fr'; 'jepha@kms.dk'; 'Kathryn.Ries@noaa.gov'; 'molugbode@yahoo.com'; 'Juha.Korhonen@liikennevirasto.fi'; 'Mathias.jonas@bsh.de'; 'Kanazawa-r4w@jha.jp'; evert.flier@statkart.no; Narayanan, Savithri; 'Julia Powell'; 'Jones Helen'; 'robert.ward@ihb.mc'
Subject: RE: WEND WG 2 meeting, 21-22nd September 2012, London - USCHC Proposal
Attachments: ANNEX A - Proposed redraft of the Amplifying Annex_USCHC working copy.doc; ANNEX A - Proposed redraft of the Amplifying Annex_USCHC working copy.pdf; ANNEX B - Proposed redraft WEND Guidelines and Amplifying Annex USCHC clean copy.doc; ANNEX B - Proposed redraft WEND Guidelines and Amplifying Annex USCHC clean copy.pdf; ANNEX B - Proposed redraft WEND Guidelines and Amplifying Annex USCHC working copy.doc; ANNEX B - Proposed redraft WEND Guidelines and Amplifying Annex USCHC working copy.pdf; WEND-WG2 Submission August 7 USCHC.doc; WEND-WG2 Submission August 7 USCHC.pdf

Dear Jamie and WEND-WG Members,

The USCHC would like to submit the attached proposal for consideration at the upcoming WEND-WG meeting. This proposal is based on the action that WEND-WG received from the 18th IHC in order to provide a way forward for discussion of the guidelines and the amplifying annex.

As you can see we have removed some items that were in the original proposal from the UK and Australia – namely the reporting requirement, as we feel that this is too much detail and would be better served by a report template.

In preparing these documents the trail of changes became quite complex but they have been retained for tracking purposes. Both MSWord and PDF versions are attached to assist in understanding and further work should it be needed.

In addition, we would like you to consider the following topics for the WEND meeting agenda as we feel that it should set the stage for follow-on work for the WEND-WG.

1. WEND-WG should develop risk assessment criteria that would define whether ENC overlaps have significant navigational concerns. This would then allow appropriate ENC management by RHCs, targeting of appropriate NAV Warnings, and guide the EUSPs should they wish to consider the withholding of ENCs.
2. Re-visit the questionnaire regarding the implementation of the WEND principles and see if there are any WEND principles that should be updated.
3. How to improve ENC consistency amongst the ENC producers. HSSC has issued ENC consistency recommendations, but it should be up to WEND-WG to see how each MS has or has not implemented them.

I have used the WEND-WG Members list from the web and regret if I have inadvertently missed someone.

Very best regards
Sean

Manager, Quality Management & Planning / Gestionnaire, Gestion de la qualité & planification
Canadian Hydrographic Service (CHS) - Service Hydrographique du Canada (SHC)
615 rue Booth Street, Ottawa, ON K1A 0E6
voice: (613) 943-9475 fax: (613) 996-9053

e-mail/ courriel sean.hinds@df-mpo.gc.ca

From: Jones Helen [mailto:Helen.Jones@UKHO.gov.uk]
Sent: August 2, 2012 5:38 AM
To: McMichael-Phillips Jamie
Subject: WEND WG 2 meeting, 21-22nd September 2012, London

Dear colleagues

On behalf of Capt. Jamie McMichael-Phillips, please find attached the main documents for the forthcoming WEND WG meeting.

This is also a call for any additional papers or agenda items you might wish to add to the draft agenda.

Bruce Harding MSocSc
International Relations Specialist
United Kingdom Hydrographic Office
TAUNTON
Somerset
TA1 2DN

Tel: +44 (0) 1823 337900 ext 5010
Email: bruce.harding@ukho.gov.uk
www.ukho.gov.uk



The contents of this e-mail and any attachments are the property of the United Kingdom Hydrographic Office and are intended for the confidential use of the named recipient only. Its unauthorised use, disclosure, storage or copying is not permitted and may be unlawful. If you are not the intended recipient, please destroy all copies and inform the sender by return e-mail. This footnote also confirms that this e-mail message has been swept by Sophos Antivirus for the presence of computer viruses. You are however advised to carry out your own virus checks.

Annex to
Guidelines for the Implementation
of the WEND Principles

Further Guidance on the procedure for resolving ENC issues

The intent of these Guidelines is to facilitate the provision of ENC coverage by the IHO community to support the use of ECDIS. The IHO commitment to IMO is to provide ENC coverage of appropriate quality and updatedness that is the equivalent to that available in an international paper chart series or in national paper chart series and should be employed to achieve this aim. This Annex is intended to outline the procedures to be followed to resolve issues such as gaps and overlaps where these undermine the IHO commitment to IMO and the WEND Principles.

NB The Guidelines (including this Annex) are NOT intended to be used to improve on existing chart coverage to meet the extended requirements of some sections of the shipping industry (eg cruise companies). In many cases these extended requirements can not be met due to the inadequacy of survey data which may also prevent the conversion of existing paper charts into ENCs. In these cases the provision of ENCs by the responsible national HO will have to wait new survey work.

A. Dealing with Gaps in ENC coverage

If gaps exist in a Coastal States' ENC coverage, then RHCs will need to facilitate action within the region, between a Member State or a group of Member States, to provide the required ENCs as an interim measure. The following procedures should be undertaken in priority order until there is a satisfactory resolution, agreed by the RHC and affected Coastal States, to close the gaps where it is feasible to make quality ENCs from existing paper chart coverage:

- a. Each RHC shall identify gaps in ENC coverage within their area of responsibility and desired timeframe for resolution, noting initial targets for coverage of shipping routes and priority ports, as well as subsequent coverage requirements.
- b. The RHC shall liaise with relevant Coastal States to determine whether the State has the capacity to meet the required timeframe as well as quality and maintenance requirements. If these requirements can be met, the Coastal State shall then fill the identified gap in ENC coverage.
- c. In the event the Coastal State cannot meet these requirements, or cannot meet the timeframe, the RHC shall report these concerns to the Inter-Regional Coordination Committee (IRCC) for further consideration and reporting by the International Hydrographic Bureau (IHB).
- d. If the identified gap is covered by an existing paper chart produced under a Bilateral Arrangement between the Coastal State and an ENC producer nation, the RHC should facilitate a mutual agreement to produce and maintain interim ENC coverage under the producer nation's producer code until such time as it may be possible to hand the ENC and its maintenance back to the Coastal State.
- e. If the identified gap is covered by an existing paper chart produced under an informal arrangement by one or more third party producer nations, the RHC should facilitate communication between the Coastal State and the third party Producer Nation(s) to produce an interim ENC. The selected producer nation shall then be invited by the RHC to produce and maintain interim ENC coverage under its own producer code until such time as it may be possible to hand the ENC and its maintenance back to the Coastal State. If no mutually agreeable solution is possible, the RHC should report the impasse accordingly through the IRCC to the IHB for appropriate reporting.
- f. If a bilateral arrangement is subsequently agreed upon between the Coastal State and a producer nation, or the Coastal State establishes the capacity to adopt and maintain the

Formatted: Right

Deleted: – USCHC original draft re-wording

Deleted: employed

Deleted: ,

Deleted: and there is otherwise no likely or timely alternatives

Deleted: to

Deleted: a

Deleted: Where

Deleted: remain

Deleted: take action

Deleted: and

Deleted: will need

Deleted: the

Deleted: via the WEND Working Group

Inserted: via the

Deleted: producer nation shall be invited by the RHC

Deleted: its own

Deleted: If there is more than one producer nation then the RHC

Deleted: will decide

Deleted: shall facilitate communications between producer nations to determine which

Inserted: shall facilitate communications between producer nations to determine

Deleted: one of them will release the

Deleted: ENC

Deleted: s

Deleted: should be released.

Inserted: should be released

Deleted: all

Deleted: s

Deleted: its members who determine the most appropriate producer nation is

Inserted: its members who

Inserted: is to produce an interim ENC

Deleted: via the WEND Working Group

Deleted: O

Inserted: O for IMO notification

Deleted: IMO notification

Deleted: B

Deleted: A

Deleted: created

interim ENC under their own producer code, this arrangement shall supersede those already in place with the interim ENC handed back to the Coastal State or the nominated producer nation.

Formatted: Right
Deleted: – USCHC original draft re-wording

B. Dealing with Overlaps in ENC coverage

Where overlaps exist in a Coastal States' ENC coverage, which compromise safety of navigation, such as a failure to load in the ECDIS, or conflicting information between ENCs, the RHCs will need to address these circumstances. The following procedures should be undertaken:

Deleted: there are
Deleted: exist
Deleted: that
Inserted: that compromise safety of navigation, such as a failure to load in the ECDIS, or conflicting information between the ENCs,

a. RHCs should create and maintain, through periodic audit, an inventory of (or some means to identify and note) areas of overlapping ENC~~s~~ and highlight those areas where there are navigationally significant differences in the overlaps.

Deleted: the
Deleted:
Deleted: then
Deleted: take action

b. RHCs should take a proactive approach to resolving overlap issues within their regions. They should produce a risk evaluation report for areas of overlap where navigationally significant differences exist and submit this through the IRCC Chair to the IHB for appropriate reporting.

Deleted: to ensure that safety of navigation is not compromised
Formatted: Indent: Left: 0 pt

c. Where urgent action is required to alert mariners to navigationally significant overlap issues then the producing nations should initiate promulgation of appropriate warnings directly with the regional NAVAREA coordinator keeping the IRCC Chair and IHB informed.

Deleted: to the
Deleted: Chair

d. End User Service Providers (EUSP) should communicate to the producer nation their concerns regarding overlaps that they feel compromises the safety of navigation, before any action is taken by the EUSP to solve the overlapping coverage. The producer nation should inform the RHC who should make every effort to address these concerns with the affected producer nations. This is particularly relevant for areas where coverage is not distributed via a RENC. If no mutually agreeable solution can be achieved, then the RHC should notify the IHO, via the IRCC for appropriate reporting.

Deleted: via the WEND Working Group and the
Inserted: via the WEND Working Group
Deleted: Appropriate action should then be initiated to inform IMO; the RHC report should highlight: ¶ ... [1]

Formatted: Highlight

Deleted: may be or has h ... [2]

Deleted: is being consid ... [3]

Inserted: is being considered

Inserted: by withdrawin ... [4]

Deleted: (including the ... [5]

Deleted: pending the ... [6]

Inserted: ;

Deleted: coastal States

Deleted: producer nation ... [7]

Inserted: producer nations

Deleted: ¶ ... [8]

Deleted: RHCs

Deleted: concerned

Deleted:

Deleted: RHCs should n ... [9]

Deleted: RHCs

Deleted: eliminate

Deleted: to eliminate a ... [10]

Deleted: s

Deleted: request an ex ... [11]

Deleted: ultimate

Deleted: to the IMO

Page 2: [1] Deleted hinds 06/08/2012 11:26 AM

Appropriate action should then be initiated to inform IMO; the RHC report should highlight:

1. the desired actions to be taken by the Governments of the involved producer States and the risks associated with inaction,
2. the action that

Page 2: [2] Deleted hinds 06/08/2012 11:26 AM

may be or has been taken

Page 2: [3] Deleted hinds 06/08/2012 11:26 AM

is being considered, in the interests of maritime safety and protection of the marine environment, by an End User Service Provider (EUSP) to eliminate the overlap by withdrawing the ENC

Page 2: [4] Inserted NOSTEMP 19/03/2012 10:05 AM

by withdrawing the ENC

Page 2: [5] Deleted hinds 06/08/2012 11:26 AM

(including the withdrawal of ENCs)

Page 2: [6] Deleted hinds 06/08/2012 11:26 AM

, pending the satisfactory resolution of matters by the

Page 2: [7] Deleted hinds 06/08/2012 11:26 AM

producer nations concerned.

Page 2: [8] Deleted hinds 06/08/2012 11:27 AM

3. If overlaps remain unresolved the EUSP should inform their customers of the situation so they may navigate on the appropriate ENC.

Page 2: [9] Deleted NOSTEMP 28/02/2012 4:32 PM

RHCs should maintain records of instances where independent action has been taken by an

Page 2: [10] Deleted NOSTEMP 28/02/2012 4:34 PM

to eliminate an overlap.

Page 2: [11] Deleted NOSTEMP 28/02/2012 4:35 PM

request an explanation from EUSPs where such action has been taken if this has not been provided

USCHC Proposed baseline – Merged Guidelines and Amplifying Annex

GUIDELINES FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE WEND PRINCIPLES

*As endorsed by the 11th WEND Committee Meeting (Tokyo, 2-5 September 2008)
With minor amendments as endorsed by the 1st WEND WG Meeting (Wollongong 13-14 October 2011)
Subsequent amendments as endorsed by the 2nd WEND WG Meeting (London 21-22 September 2012)*

The International Hydrographic Organization (IHO) is encouraging the transition from paper charts to electronic navigation through its support of a carriage requirement for ECDIS. It follows that the IHO should ensure that mariners are well served by adequate ENC services.

Noting that there are significant improvements required related to coverage, consistency, quality, updating and distribution of ENCs for many parts of the world and that this needs urgent attention, the Inter-Regional Coordination Committee (IRCC), as serving the interim role of the WEND Committee, invites IHO Member States to apply the following guidelines for the implementation of the Wend principles (IHO Resolution 1/1997 as amended).

1 Responsibilities of Coastal States

- 1.1 A mandatory carriage requirement for ECDIS means a consequential obligation on Coastal States to ensure the provision of ENCs.
- 1.2 If the Coastal State is the issuing authority (in terms of SOLAS V 2.2) then responsibility for the ENCs should lie with it regardless of whether the production and maintenance is undertaken with the assistance of commercial contractors or another Member State.
- 1.3 Subject to appropriate agreement, it is acceptable for a Member State or a group of Member States to produce ENCs as an interim measure to fill gaps in existing Coastal States' coverage to promote contiguous coverage. Such ENCs should be withdrawn when adequate coverage is made available by the Coastal State.
- 1.4 Where agreement is given to another Member State to produce and issue ENCs on behalf of a Coastal State the producing / issuing Member State should carry the responsibility for the ENC.
- 1.5 States providing source data to another State for the compilation of ENCs should advise that producer State of update information in a timely manner.
- 1.6 Member States should take into consideration the complexity and resource requirements of the ENC production and maintenance task in relation to their own capabilities and options when deciding how to best ensure the provision of ENCs for their waters.
- 1.7 In order to ensure uniform quality and consistency of the WEND, Member States should cooperate in accordance with clause 1.3 of the WEND Principles, in particular by strongly considering harmonisation¹ and / or distribution through a RENC. Member States and RENCs should cooperate to ensure that ENCs are harmonised to the same quality standards thereby facilitating integrated services.
- 1.8 Member States not wishing to join a RENC should make appropriate arrangements to ensure that their ENCs meet WEND requirements for consistency and quality and are widely distributed.
- 1.9 To ensure that the WEND database is maintained to the highest quality standard Member States that identify an error or any other deficiency in an issued ENC, or that receive information indicating such a deficiency, must bring this to the attention of the ENC producer so that the problem can be resolved at the earliest opportunity. Member States should act to ensure that appropriate actions are taken so that the safety of navigation is not compromised.

¹ *Harmonization means the uniform implementation of S-57 and other applicable standards, according to common IHO implementation rules as described in S-58, S-65 and the S-57 Encoding Bulletins.*

USCHC Proposed baseline – Merged Guidelines and Amplifying Annex

- 1.10 Member States only need to consider the use of S-63 if they intend to deliver a service to end users. Data Servers (i.e. service providers) and equipment manufacturers are responsible for implementing S-63 and form part of the ‘S-63 trusted circle’ (i.e. are entrusted to protect the ENC’s and the encryption process).

2 Dealing with Gaps in ENC Coverage

- 2.1 Exceptionally, a Member State may, through an appropriate agreement, create additional ENC’s to facilitate unified coverage where such production is undertaken specifically to address issues inhibiting provision of ENC coverage for the safety of navigation in accordance with the long term aims of the WEND Principles. RHC’s should place a high priority on filling ENC gaps.

- 2.2 If gaps exist in Coastal States’ ENC coverage then RHC’s will need to facilitate action within the region, between a Member State or a group of Member States, to provide the required ENC’s as an interim measure. The following procedures should be undertaken in priority order until there is satisfactory resolution, agreed by the RHC and affected Coastal States, to close the gaps where it is feasible to make quality ENC’s from existing paper chart coverage:

- a. Each RHC shall identify gaps in ENC coverage within their area of responsibility and desired timeframe for resolution, noting initial targets for coverage of shipping routes and priority ports, as well as subsequent coverage requirements.
- b. The RHC shall liaise with relevant Coastal States to determine whether the State has the capacity to meet the required timeframe as well as quality and maintenance requirements. If these requirements can be met, the Coastal State shall be encouraged to fill the identified gap in ENC coverage.
- c. In the event the Coastal State cannot meet these obligations, or cannot meet the timeframe, the RHC shall report these concerns to the IRCC for further consideration and reporting by the International Hydrographic Bureau (IHB).
- d. If the identified gap is covered by an existing paper chart produced under a Bilateral Arrangement between the Coastal State and an ENC producer nation, the RHC shall facilitate a mutual agreement to produce and maintain interim ENC coverage under the producer nation’s ~~its own~~ producer code until such time as it may be possible to hand the ENC and its maintenance back to the Coastal State.
- e. If the identified gap is covered by an existing paper chart produced under an informal arrangement by one or more third party producer nations, the RHC should facilitate communication between the Coastal State and the third party producer nation(s) to produce an interim ENC. The selected producer nation shall then be invited by the RHC to produce and maintain interim ENC coverage under its own producer code until such time as it may be possible to hand the ENC and its maintenance back to the Coastal State. If no mutually agreeable solution is possible, the RHC should report the impasse accordingly through the IRCC to the IHB for appropriate reporting.
- f. If a bilateral arrangement is subsequently agreed upon between the Coastal State and a producer nation, or the Coastal State establishes the capacity to adopt and maintain the interim ENC under their own producer code, this arrangement shall supersede those already in place with the interim ENC handed back to the Coastal State or the nominated producer nation.

3 Dealing with Overlaps in ENC coverage

- 3.1 The S-57 Standard requires that there is no overlap of ENC data within usage bands. ECDIS systems will operate unpredictably in areas where overlapping ENC data is present; for this reason overlapping ENC data is not acceptable in end-user services. Where overlapping coverage exists the producing States should recognize their responsibility and take the necessary steps to resolve the situation. In situations where overlapping data cannot be resolved through negotiation, the ENC producer(s) can anticipate that an end user service provider may need to take action itself to eliminate the overlap or discontinue services until the issue is satisfactorily addressed. Any such action to eliminate overlap should be communicated in advance to the affected ENC producer(s) and be based on guidelines that emphasize navigation safety, such as the following:

USCHC Proposed baseline – Merged Guidelines and Amplifying Annex

1. Scale of the data compiled in the ENC,
 2. Currency of data in the ENC - i.e. most recent surveys, shoalest soundings, wrecks, rocks, and obstructions,
 3. Avoidance of dividing navigationally significant features between producers. For example, Traffic Separation Schemes should be handled by one producer or the other.
- 3.2 Where overlaps exist in a Coastal States' ENC coverage which compromise safety of navigation, such as a failure to load in the ECDIS, or significant conflicting information between ENCs, the RHCs will need to address these circumstances. The following procedures should be undertaken:
- a. RHCs should create and maintain, through periodic audit, an inventory of (or some means to identify and note) areas of overlapping ENCs and highlight those areas where there are navigationally significant differences in the overlaps.
 - b. RHCs should take a proactive approach to resolving overlap issues within their regions. They should produce a risk evaluation report for areas of overlap where navigationally significant differences exist and submit this to through the IRCC Chair to the IHB for appropriate reporting.
 - c. Where urgent action is required to alert mariners to navigationally significant overlap issues then the concerned producing nations should initiate promulgation of appropriate warnings directly with the regional NAVAREA coordinator keeping the IRCC Chair and IHB informed.
 - d. End User Service Providers (EUSP) should communicate to the producer nation their concerns regarding overlaps that they feel compromises the safety of navigation, before any action is taken by the EUSP to solve the overlapping coverage. These producer nations should inform the RHCs who should make every effort to address these concerns with the affected producer nations. If no mutually agreeable solution can be achieved, then the RHC should notify the IHO, via the IRCC for appropriate reporting.

4. Capacity Building and Cooperation

- 4.1 Assistance to coastal States may cover aspects such as development of an ENC production capability, ENC quality and the role of RENCs in ENC validation and distribution.
- 4.2 It is essential that coastal States have established cartographic capability and infrastructure prior to undertaking ENC production and maintenance tasks themselves so as to ensure that the ENCs within the WEND database meet the high quality standards necessary to fulfill SOLAS requirements.
- 4.3 IHO Member States should consider ENC related projects as high priority capacity building initiatives.

Key to Changes:

Black Text – No Change to wording from the original guidelines (note that the clause may have been moved)

Blue Text – additional wording added to an existing guideline

Red Text – New Information added

Green Text – USCHC amendments

GUIDELINES FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE WEND PRINCIPLES

As endorsed by the 11th WEND Committee Meeting (Tokyo, 2-5 September 2008)

With minor amendments as endorsed by the 1st WEND WG Meeting (Wollongong 13-14 October 2011)

Subsequent amendments as endorsed by the 2nd WEND WG Meeting (London 21-22 September 2012)

The International Hydrographic Organization (IHO) is encouraging the transition from paper charts to electronic navigation through its support of a carriage requirement for ECDIS. It follows that the IHO should ensure that mariners are well served by adequate ENC services.

Noting that there are significant improvements required related to coverage, consistency, quality, updating and distribution of ENCs for many parts of the world and that this needs urgent attention, the Inter-Regional Coordination Committee (IRCC), as serving the interim role of the WEND Committee, invites IHO Member States to apply the following guidelines for the implementation of the Wend principles (IHO Resolution 1/1997 as amended).

1 Responsibilities of Coastal States

- 1.1 A mandatory carriage requirement for ECDIS means a consequential obligation on Coastal States to ensure the provision of ENCs.
- 1.2 If the Coastal State is the issuing authority (in terms of SOLAS V 2.2) then responsibility for the ENCs should lie with it regardless of whether the production and maintenance is undertaken with the assistance of commercial contractors or another Member State.
- 1.3 Subject to appropriate agreement, it is acceptable for a Member State or a group of Member States to produce ENCs as an interim measure to fill gaps in existing Coastal States' coverage to promote contiguous coverage. Such ENCs should be withdrawn when adequate coverage is made available by the Coastal State.
- 1.4 Where agreement is given to another Member State to produce and issue ENCs on behalf of a Coastal State the producing / issuing Member State should carry the responsibility for the ENC.
- 1.5 States providing source data to another State for the compilation of ENCs should advise that producer State of update information in a timely manner.
- 1.6 Member States should take into consideration the complexity and resource requirements of the ENC production and maintenance task in relation to their own capabilities and options when deciding how to best ensure the provision of ENCs for their waters.
- 1.7 In order to ensure uniform quality and consistency of the WEND, Member States should cooperate in accordance with clause 1.3 of the WEND Principles, in particular by strongly considering harmonisation¹ and / or distribution through a RENC. Member States and RENCs should cooperate to ensure that ENCs are harmonised to the same quality standards thereby facilitating integrated services.

¹ Harmonization means the uniform implementation of S-57 and other applicable standards, according to common IHO implementation rules as described in S-58, S-65 and the S-57 Encoding Bulletins.

USCHC Proposed baseline – Merged Guidelines and Amplifying Annex

- 1.8 Member States not wishing to join a RENC should make appropriate arrangements to ensure that their ENC's meet WEND requirements for consistency and quality and are widely distributed.
- 1.9 To ensure that the WEND database is maintained to the highest quality standard Member States that identify an error or any other deficiency in an issued ENC, or that receive information indicating such a deficiency, must bring this to the attention of the ENC producer so that the problem can be resolved at the earliest opportunity. Member States should act to ensure that appropriate actions are taken so that the safety of navigation is not compromised.
- 1.10 Member States only need to consider the use of S-63 if they intend to deliver a service to end users. Data Servers (i.e. service providers) and equipment manufacturers are responsible for implementing S-63 and form part of the 'S-63 trusted circle' (i.e. are entrusted to protect the ENC's and the encryption process).

2 Dealing with Gaps in ENC Coverage

- 2.1 Exceptionally, a Member State may, **through an appropriate agreement**, create additional ENC's to facilitate unified coverage where such production is undertaken specifically to address issues inhibiting provision of ENC coverage for the safety of navigation in accordance with the long term aims of the WEND Principles. ~~A Member State undertaking such production should have very valid reasons for its actions and, beforehand, should have made reasonable efforts to negotiate with and come to some agreement with the State that has jurisdiction over the area in question. RHCs should place a high priority on filling ENC gaps.~~
- 2.2 ~~If gaps exist in Coastal States' ENC coverage then RHCs will need to facilitate action within the region, between a Member State or a group of Member States, to provide the required ENC's as an interim measure. The following procedures should be undertaken in priority order until there is satisfactory resolution, agreed by the RHC and affected Coastal States, to close the gaps where it is feasible to make quality ENC's from existing paper chart coverage:~~
 - a. ~~Each RHC shall identify gaps in ENC coverage within their area of responsibility and desired timeframe for resolution, noting initial targets for coverage of shipping routes and priority ports, as well as subsequent coverage requirements.~~
 - b. ~~The RHC shall liaise with relevant Coastal States to determine whether the State has the capacity to meet the required timeframe as well as quality and maintenance requirements. If these requirements can be met, the Coastal State shall be encouraged to fill the identified gap in ENC coverage.~~
 - c. ~~In the event the Coastal State cannot meet these obligations, or cannot meet the timeframe, the RHC shall report these concerns to the IRCC via the WEND Working Group for further consideration and reporting by the International Hydrographic Bureau (IHB).~~
 - d. ~~If the identified gap is covered by an existing paper chart produced under a Bilateral Arrangement between the Coastal State and an ENC producer nation, the RHC shall facilitate a mutual agreement producer nation shall be invited by the RHC to produce and maintain interim ENC coverage under the producer nation's its own producer code until such time as it may be possible to hand the ENC and its maintenance back to the Coastal State. If there is more than one producer nation then the RHC shall facilitate communications between producer nations to determine which ENC should be released.~~
 - e. ~~If the identified gap is covered by an existing paper chart produced under an informal arrangement by one or more third party producer nations, the RHC should facilitate communication between the Coastal State and the third party producer nation(s) to produce an interim ENC. The selected producer nation shall then be invited by the RHC to produce and maintain interim ENC coverage under its own producer code until such time as it may be possible to hand the ENC and its maintenance back to the Coastal State. If no mutually agreeable solution is possible, the RHC should report the impasse accordingly through the IRCC to the IHB for appropriate reporting.~~
 - f. ~~If a bilateral arrangement is subsequently agreed upon between the Coastal State and a producer nation, or the Coastal State establishes the capacity to adopt and maintain the interim ENC under their own producer~~

USCHC Proposed baseline – Merged Guidelines and Amplifying Annex

code, this arrangement shall supersede those already in place with the interim ENC handed back to the Coastal State or the nominated producer nation.

3 Dealing with Overlaps in ENC coverage

3.1 The S-57 Standard requires that there is no overlap of ENC data within usage bands. ECDIS systems will operate unpredictably in areas where overlapping ENC data is present; for this reason overlapping ENC data is not acceptable in end-user services. Where overlapping coverage exists the producing States should recognize their responsibility and take the necessary steps to resolve the situation. In situations where overlapping data cannot be resolved through negotiation, the ENC producer(s) can anticipate that an end user service provider may need to take action itself to eliminate the overlap or discontinue services until the issue is satisfactorily addressed. Any such action to eliminate overlap should be communicated in advance to the affected ENC producer(s) and be based on guidelines that emphasize navigation safety, such as the following:

1. Scale of the data compiled in the ENC,
2. Currency of data in the ENC - i.e. most recent surveys, shoalest soundings, wrecks, rocks, and obstructions,
3. Avoidance of dividing navigationally significant features between producers. For example, Traffic Separation Schemes should be handled by one producer or the other.

3.2 Where overlaps exist in a Coastal States' ENC coverage which compromise safety of navigation, such as a failure to load in the ECDIS, or significant conflicting information between ENCs, the RHCs will need to address these circumstances. The following procedures should be undertaken:

- a. RHCs should create and maintain, through periodic audit, an inventory of (or some means to identify and note) areas of overlapping ENCs and highlight those areas where there are navigationally significant differences in the overlaps.
- b. RHCs should take a proactive approach to resolving overlap issues within their regions. They should produce a risk evaluation report for areas of overlap where navigationally significant differences exist and submit this to through the IRCC Chair to the IHB for appropriate reporting.
- c. Where urgent action is required to alert mariners to navigationally significant overlap issues then the concerned producing nations should initiate promulgation of appropriate warnings directly with the regional NAVAREA coordinator keeping the IRCC Chair and IHB informed.
- d. End User Service Providers (EUSP) should communicate to the producer nation RHCs their concerns regarding overlaps that they feel compromises the safety of navigation, before any action is taken by the EUSP to eliminate solve the overlapping coverage. These producer nations should inform the RHCs who should make every effort to address these concerns with the affected producer nations. This is particularly relevant for areas where coverage is not distributed via a RENC. If no mutually agreeable solution can be achieved, then the RHC should notify the IHO, via the IRCC for appropriate reporting ultimate reporting to the IMO.

2. Reference Standards and Implementation

2.1. Harmonization means the uniform implementation of S-57 and other applicable standards, according to common IHO implementation rules as described in S-58, S-65 and the S-57 Encoding Bulletins.

Comment: Merged with 1.7 and part of a new footnote

2.2. Member States not wishing to join a RENC should make appropriate arrangements to ensure that their ENCs meet WEND requirements for consistency and quality and are widely distributed.

Comment: Moved to 1.8

3.4. Capacity Building and Cooperation

USCHC Proposed baseline – Merged Guidelines and Amplifying Annex

4.1. Assistance to coastal States may cover aspects such as development of an ENC production capability, ENC quality and the role of RENCs in ENC validation and distribution.

4.2. It is essential that coastal States have established cartographic capability and infrastructure prior to undertaking ENC production and maintenance tasks themselves so as to ensure that the ENCs within the WEND database meet the high quality standards necessary to fulfill SOLAS requirements.

4.3. IHO Member States should consider ENC related projects as high priority capacity building initiatives.

4. Integrated services

4.1. Member States and RENCs should cooperate to ensure that ENCs are harmonised to the same quality standards thereby facilitating integrated services.

Comment: Merged into 1.7

4.2. Member States only need to consider the use of S-63 if they intend to deliver a service to end users. Data Servers (i.e. service providers) and equipment manufacturers are responsible for implementing S-63 and form part of the 'S-63 trusted circle' (i.e. are entrusted to protect the ENCs and the encryption process).

Comment: Moved to 1.10

**Paper for Consideration by WEND-WG
Amendments to the WEND Guidelines**

Submitted by:	USCHC
Executive Summary:	This paper proposes amendments to the Guidelines for the Implementation of the WEND Principles and to formalize them as an IHO Technical Resolution
Related Documents:	Guidelines to the Implementation of the WEND Principles M-3 Technical Resolution – Hydrographic Office Arrangements for the exchange and reproduction of Nautical Products 7/1919 as amended 8/1993 –A3.4
Related Projects:	N/A

Introduction / Background

Recognizing that a great deal of progress has been made regarding global ENC coverage, the WEND WG seeks to focus coastal state attention on resolving gaps and overlaps in the interest of maritime safety. At its meeting in Wollongong (October 2011), the WG developed additional guidance giving the RHCs a key role in this endeavour and detailing action steps to be taken.

After the meeting in Australia, the WEND WG submitted a proposal to the IHC recommending that member states approve the following:

- the minor updates to the main text of K 2.19, the WEND Principles
- the amendments to the Guidelines for the Implementation of the WEND Principles
- the inclusion of an amplifying Annex to the Guidelines for the Implementation of the WEND Principles

Analysis/Discussion

At the IHC, the member states approved the amendments to the WEND Principles; however, it was decided that the proposed amendments to the Guidelines and inclusion of an Amplifying Annex to the Guidelines were not ready for adoption and referred them back to the WEND WG for further consideration and refinement.

While the USCHC supports the concept of the Amplifying Annex to the Guidelines, it does not support some of the language in the Annex as currently stated. The USCHC feels that this language gives too much authority to the Regional Hydrographic Commissions which are not formal bodies of the IHO, but rather “*regional bodies, established by Member States and recognized by the Assembly to improve regional coordination, enhance exchange of information and foster training and technical assistance.*” (IHO General Regulations, Article 8.) Some of the language in the previous draft of the Amplifying Annex implied that RHCs have ultimate decision making authority which they do not and neither does the IHO itself as solely a technical and consultative body. The USCHC proposes that some of the language of the draft Amplifying Annex be softened to reflect the role that the RHCs should have in facilitating progress on these issues, rather than making unilateral decisions on behalf of affected Member States.

As a starting point the USCHC began with amending the language of the amplifying annex (Annex A). However, during this process, we noted that between the original guidelines and the new annex that both concepts and language were duplicated. As a result, the USCHC

opted to merge the amplifying annex with the WEND guidelines in order to provide a cohesive document for consideration (Annex B).

The Technical Resolution (TR) 7/1919 should be noted as addressing similar considerations in the exchange and production of other nautical products. Given TR 7/1919 references the WEND Principles it is suggested that the WENDWG could consider if and how the WEND Principles or the WEND Guidelines can reference back to TR 7/1919.

Recommendations

The USCHC proposes for WEND to consider Annex B as a baseline for discussions. The merger of the WEND Guidelines and Amplifying Annex to the Guidelines into a single document will eliminate the duplicative wording between the two, reduce confusion and keep it succinct.

Furthermore, USCHC recommends that the revised guidelines be submitted to the IHO Member States as a Technical Resolution in order to raise the visibility and importance of the Guidelines. It should be noted that the WEND Principles are a Technical Resolution of the IHO, but the current Guidelines are only hosted on the WEND-WG section of the IHO website. Once the WEND-WG has agreed to the language in the revised guidelines it should seek guidance from the IHB on the best approach for implementing it as a IHO technical resolution. For example, should the guidelines be a standalone technical resolution or should it be appended to the WEND principles, which are already an IHO Technical Resolution.

Justification and Impacts

The USCHC supports the concepts that are reflected in Annex B because the RHCs can and should play a proactive role in addressing ENC coverage, especially gaps and overlaps. The steps outlined Annex B are valuable, necessary and consistent with how the United States runs the MACHC Electronic Chart Committee to build coverage in its region. The inclusion of additional guidance to the existing Guidelines will enable each of the RHCs to follow at a high level a similar process in dealing with the same issues.

Action Required of WEND-WG

The WEND Committee is invited to:

- a. Agree to use the revised Guidelines proposed in Annex B as a starting point for discussion
- b. Agree to recommend to the Inter-Regional Coordination Committee the revised guidelines (once agreed to by WEND-WG) as a Technical Resolution for Member States' vote and approval.

Attachments

Annex A

Annex B