

**Minutes of the  
NORTH SEA HYDROGRAPHIC COMMISSION  
30<sup>th</sup> meeting in Ålesund, Norway  
19th- 21st of June 2012**

## **A. OPENING FORMALITIES**

### **A1 Opening Remarks**

The NSHC chairman, IGA Bruno Frachon, opened the conference with the following words:

*Dear Colleagues,*

*As chairman, it is a pleasure to welcome you to the 30th North Sea Hydrographic Conference here in Norway.*

*First of all, we would like to thank both the Norwegian Hydrographic Office and the local authorities for hosting this main event within the European hydrographic community in Ålesund, on a coast where hydrographic issues are numerous and very complex.*

*This year is more particularly the occasion of celebrating the 30th anniversary of our Regional Hydrographic Commission, which is used to being one of the most active regional hydrographic commissions and a key enabler of the IHO programme of work, beyond the region.*

*And what better occasion than this anniversary to welcome for the first time some representative of the Industrial community. So we are pleased to welcome Konsberg, Jepessen and the Pôle Mer Bretagne for the 30th edition of NSHC. We may also remind that a significant number of the IHO TR comes from inputs or original ideas issued by the NSHC, due to the membership of this commission including the most advanced Hydrographic Offices in the world.*

*No need to be convinced of that tremendous contribution while having a look at the comprehensive list of the NSHC conclusions, a compilation of which has been made over the last years, thanks to the work achieved by the UKHO and Steve Shipman of the IHB.*

*Besides, we still have a significant amount of work to achieve in the IHO, therefore under the responsibility of this commission.*

*We are also very grateful to Admiral Maratos to participate in this conference before he retires as president of the directing committee of the IHB.*

*Finally, I wish all of us a successful 30th edition of the North Sea Hydrographic Conference and a nice stay here in Norway.*

The 30<sup>th</sup> NSHC conference host, Mr. Evert Flier, Head of the Norwegian Hydrographic Office, gave a warm welcome to all the participants to Norway, more particularly Admiral Maratos, IHB representative, for his last participation to an NSHC conference. He also gave a warm welcome the Norwegian Maritime Administration Director (NO coastguards) to this 30<sup>th</sup> NSHC conference.

Mr. Flier then shared some overall remarks with the members about the need to raise our hand in the politic world to show the value of our data.

He added that the true challenge nowadays for us is to raise awareness, to share the use for our data and to improve ways to navigation.

The Chair thanked NO for sharing his view.

The Chair asked for a roundtable for everyone to introduce.

All members agreed that every subjects of the commission should be discussed openly, in presence of non-members participants.

### **A2 Administrative Arrangements**

NO gave details of the practical arrangements for the conference.

### **A3 Adoption of Agenda and Timetable**

The secretary introduced the list of documents. He presented the final revision of the Agenda, 11th version. The chair underlined that the agenda was very ambitious and recommended that the agenda items should be introduced shortly followed by questions and answers.

The Agenda was adopted by the NSHC members.

The chair gave a report of the activities and results during the interval since the last conference, as requested by the NSHC statutes:

*Since our last commission held in Brest in September 2010, the NSHC activities has been highlighted by the following events.*

*The XVIIIth IHC held in Monaco last April has been the opportunity of the official signature of the MoU between the IHO and the European Commission represented by Commissioner M. Damanaki;*

*Since the last NSHC meetings in which the IRCC Chair participated, providing important updates, the NSHC was represented by its acting Chair (FR) at the IRCC3 meeting, and recently at IRCC4 meeting two weeks ago in Singapore;*

*It is also worth noting that a number of NSHC HOs are involved in the IHO capacity building activities (DE who chairs the CBSC, NO, UK, FR) and that NO currently represents the NSHC at the CBSC meetings, of which the 10th edition was held two weeks ago in Singapore.*

*Besides, the NSHC established the NS ENC Harmonisation WG and was represented in the WEND-WG meeting held in Wollongong 13-14 Oct. 2011.*

*All the results related to those main events will be commented and discussed throughout the various topics of that 30th North Sea Hydrographic Conference.*

#### **A4 Assignment of NSHC active conclusions to relevant agenda items**

The secretary introduced the NSHC list of conclusions.

The chair proposed that all active conclusions status should be reviewed to make sure they still are.

## **B. CORPORATE AFFAIRS**

#### **B1 NSHC statutes amended and approved version.**

The secretary displayed the amended version of NSHC statutes.

All members agreed on the new statutes version.

The chair then suggested that action NSHC-5 should be marked as « effected ».

UK asked the chair for the floor to welcome Ireland as new member to NSHC.

IHB then took the floor to congratulate the chair and all members for the 30th anniversary of the NSHC commission.

UK pointed at there's a need to reconsider structures of regional Hydrographic commissions (RHC) to bring coherence in terms of navigation safety.

IHB and NO thanked UK for pointing at this question.

NO mentioned that the NHC commission is the only non-geographic related commission in northern Europe and that it's considered as a laboratory for HO's.

NL précised that the BSHC commission is, as the NHC, to be considered more as a community, a laboratory for those HO's.

DE has doubts with the merging of this conference, considering that the creation of a larger HC is not appropriated.

FR thanks UK for this important matter, thinking IRCC should be asked to reconsider the RHC structure to bring more coherence (IRCC level needed as INT region is involved).

UK impressed by the work from BSHC.

DK considers that BSHC is more practical, that NSHC is more political.

DE thinks the cooperation within EU area should be improved and that the merging of HC is not a solutions as proper ways of improving the HC union cannot be found.

The chair pointed at that European countries are not all faced towards the North Sea or the Baltic Sea; HC are more related to sea bassins. So the real question would rather be choosing between a land mass coordination or a sea bassin one.

Then the chair suggested to postpone this topic to the end of the meeting. All members agreed.

#### **B2 Status of the ratification of the protocol of amendments to the IHO convention and pending applications for IHO membership.**

IHB pointed at the fact that, in 7 years, only 36 approvals of the protocol have been gathered so far, over the 38 requested. This situation around the adoption process starts to be tricky, bringing undesired issues. So that to end up this status quo, countries that have not approved have been asked to precise if they are hesitating or waiting for the green light.

IHB then pointed out that Belgium is the last European country not to have approved the protocol of amendments.

FR suggested providing an executive summary explaining the role of the protocol of amendments in addition to the two circular letters sent every year. IHB replied it would be glad to do so.

BE apologized for not responding to the IHB approval request, explaining that the new protocol must be ratified by both Flemish and Walloon speakers before national approval.

**@ : IHB to provide an executive summary in order to explain the benefices of such a protocol.**

### **B3 IHO and European Union (EU) cooperation and policy**

FR apologized on behalf of DG Mare representative, Mr. Ian Shepherd, for cancelling his venue.

Admiral Ramos da Silva (Instituto Hydrographico - Portugal) was also invited but could not make it.

Then FR thanked Admiral Theodosiou (Greece), chairman of the Black Sea and Mediterranean Sea Commission (MBSHC) for attending the conference.

FR reminded the audience that the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between the IHO and the EU commission was signed last April, during the 18<sup>th</sup> IHC.

After presenting EU's Marine Knowledge 2020 project, FR declared that from EU point of view, HOs don't share enough data and that only a few HOs are involved in EMODNET program so far.

Mr. Michael Bergmann, Jeppesen representative, confessed there's lots of confusions with all those EU projects. Besides, he don't see any discussion on the intent of use, only about data availability. He also précised that free availability would be welcomed.

UK commented that 30 millions a year invested in EU projects is a lot.

So far, nothing less than five HC are not represented in that project.

So UK asked how could the cooperation with EU be coordinated?

DK point out that HO's have been involved by providing data, and that it should exist an inventory of data detained by HO's (+ metadata at least).

DE asked which role would HOs have in that scope.

DE considers that free of use does not mean free of charge. HOs may build their part based on IHO standardization. So far, it looks like HOs are only data suppliers. Is it acceptable?

DE added that the power of being involved in a cross-bordered initiative (like BLAST) is still underestimated, and that there is still (lots of) some expertise from HOs side to provide

DE considers the real issue is how to interface with the EU as HOs., how to expose our strength in data gathering.

UK agreed to what DE spotted on by emphasizing on the need to engage with the EU commission: data gathering has a cost, no one shall forget it. All we want to influence this debate, not to be restrained as data providers.

IHB agreed about the importance of this topic and thanked FR which took a good part in elaborating this MoU. IHB then suggested arranging a meeting between EU and HOs experts about which support could be provided to this project. IHB suggested they could initiate it by approaching DG Mare with a letter.

The chair took the floor reaffirming HOs can't be only restrained to data providers: HOs have expertise have a concern/knowledge/expertise regarding use of data that can be shared, and there is no doubt on how supportive they could be on that project and policy matter.

FR thanked UK for its relevant comment. EU coop is both a threat and opportunity.

FR then presented proposal for EU cooperation, as result of the dedicated WG's work:

- **NSHC EU2MWG should be the focal point for EU policy matters;**
- **Enlarging the participation to other RHCs;**

It is a fact that EU commission urges us to demonstrate that European HOs are able to organize themselves to meet EU requirements.

**@ : NSHC members to confirm and update their POC to participate to EU2MWG.**

NL thanked FR for its interesting approach and suggested that the introduction of those issues to IRCC should also be relevant.

NL affirmed their support those proposals made up by FR and suggested to extend this regional cooperation on an IHO scale.

DE agreed with NL point of view to bring IRCC as focal point instead of IHB.

DE also suggested that EUM2WG should gather every year.

UK answered that this EU cooperation is a regional issue, no to be brought up to IRCC.

DE insisted on the importance to bring other regions and that IRCC has the body of IHO: other regions could get inputs from this matter.

UK repeated IRCC has a too international dimension, not relevant with a regional matter.

IHB emphasized that a group needs to be tasked on the one hand and that a paper/roadmap needs to be drafted and presented to the EU to be discussed on the other hand.

IHB added that those documents related to this initiative could be addressed to IRCC and other RHC.

IHB concluded by reminded the audience that they have to act quickly and most of all avoid bureaucracy in this matter. An IHB directing committee will gather on July 29<sup>th</sup> about this topic.

FR agreed with IHB that we have to be active and that working under a small group structure is preferable.

NL : thanks to FR for efforts in that matter.

SE agreed to be POC for BHC, NO for ARCHC, UK for MACHC, DE agreed too but understood that it has to remain a small group.

BE admitted they don't have enough staff to participate, however they can attend the IHO-EU meeting.

UK asked which mechanisms are used to track those efforts by HO's from EU ?

The chair replied UK that it could be important matter to be discussed during inter sessional work.

The chair emphasized that the Mediterranean region involvement and opinion is very important to this commission and asked GR what are the best ways to participate ?

GR answered they would like to be part of the initiative.

IHB underlined there won't be any delays issues (as pointed by UK) with the arrival of the new directing committee. Adm. Maratos suggested that this IHO-EU meeting should be scheduled in September 2012, not in October.

FR replied October was pointed at as September seems quite busy (HSSC04, SAIHC9). Anyway FR will ask DG Mare for available dates in September.

Chair asked BE if they could be involved in the organization of this workshop.

BE accepted to take a part in the organization of that event.

FR underlined on the need to concentrate our efforts to make up one unique main event.

The Chair recalled everyone that the NSHC has to report formally to the IRCC from this workshop about points to be discussed. The commission is waiting for concrete proposal. Moreover, within this scope, capacity building can't be forgotten as HO's are involved in hydro capacity building worldwide.

The Chair concluded on the importance to involve regions beyond Europe basic limits.

FR took the floor to announce that an engineer will be specially appointed for EU matters at the external relations division: ICETA Yves-Henri Renhas.

### **B3.1 Licensing issues relating to data exchange and commercial producers.**

FR gave a introductory presentation about licensing issues (fiche B3.1):

#### Summary

*While the business model for nautical charts and ENC has been well established for some years, it is currently being challenged by at least two converging forces. On the one hand, the “open data” movement is getting stronger and stronger in European societies. It corresponds to a social demand for transparency in the public sphere and free access to public data. On the other hand, European Union initiatives globally aim at making public data freely accessible, especially because EU considers that such a policy will create globally more growth than in the current situation. For example, the INSPIRE directive makes it mandatory for discovery and viewing services to be free; discussions are also currently taking place in order to revise the public sector information (PSI) directive, with the European Commission initially proposing that every public data should be sold only at the marginal costs of dissemination, except in “exceptional cases”.*

#### Analysis

*Our purpose is not to discuss whether these political orientations are sound and wise or not, but only to look at their financial consequences. These new considerations have to be taken into account, as they could undermine the financial models of HOs and RENC, in particular. Indeed, many HOs have an “hybrid” financial model, implying that part (or most) of their budget relies on “commercial” revenues, especially from the sales of nautical products (paper charts, ENC, etc.). If these data become “open data”, governments would have to compensate for the missing revenues; however, in the current economic context, many believe that no compensation would take place. Secondly, RENC’s financial models would also have to be modified. If some nations decide that their products are freely usable and available for commercial use at the marginal cost of distribution, models taking into account the amount of sales for sharing RENC’s costs might need to be revised to make sure that RENC operations can go on. In addition, data exchanges usually made through bilateral agreements in accordance with IHO Resolution 7/1919 as amended, could be hampered if some nations continue to charge for their data while other ones make them free. Financial flows currently in place between HOs are pretty balanced: they could become unidirectional.*

*FR-NSHCsubmission-licensing\_v3 – 14 June 2012*

#### Recommendations

*An analysis of the situation and the approval of a common stance of HOs, if possible, is recommended. The following points should be addressed:*

- 1. HOs should try and define a common viewpoint on the data they produce: what are the data subjected to the PSI directive in particular? Raw databases? S-57 data? ENC (S-63) data? Other data? What are the data or products considered as “value-added” products, that would not have to be “open data” even if the movement gains momentum?*
- 2. It would also be interesting for HOs to share their viewpoint with the European commission and parliament concerning the nautical charts and ENC market. Is it possible to let every nation decide whether their nautical data are free or not, while data exchanges between them are essential? Would that really improve efficiency, cooperation and finally safety at sea for mariners? Two situations look stable: when everyone does not charge any royalties (but is it realistic and feasible?), or when everyone keeps the current business model. Is there any other model providing stability?*

#### Action required

*The HOs are invited to consider this document and endorse it as part of their programme of work; undertake the tasks listed in its recommendations; provide results by October 2012 so as to provide suggestions to the European commission and parliament before the end of the year.*

The actual situation is characterized by the existence of different business models as well as for a social demand for transparency.

In addition to that, EU asks for free access to data (« data is the new gold »).

EU proposed that data should be accessed a minimum cost of dissemination, excepted for exceptional cases.

In the end, two situations are rather clear:

- when the data access is free from all HO's;
- when everyone keeps its current business model.

FR presented their recommendations and popped the question of the approach: should it be common or individual?

FR added that providing results by October 2012, before EU IMP revision, would be highly appreciated.

---

- Lunch break -

---

The chair took the floor to invite all members to comment FR presentation.

NO admitted FR brought up complete and complex subjects.

NO pointed out that assembled data should not be very expensive ; but assembling new data comes from selling existing ones, it is something we have to take in the bare of our hands and show EU the real cost of giving free data access.

Mr. Bergmann (Jeppesen) raised the question of the use of free data. What do we want to be available? EU programs status is rather complicated (started but not ended, numerous ones).

In the end we noticed the existence of 40 different contracts + many licensing terms.

The main problem for the industry is that data is available but there's no way to set contract to get access to it.

UK replied there's no problems in releasing raw data, but problems in releasing compelled products do exist. Moreover, the existence of different definitions of raw data makes that UK prefers staying with its current licensing model.

DE took the floor to add they attended a workshop in Hamburg before CHI18 about this topic.

It pointed out the existence of different interpretations of IMP (PSI), and that charts are different to geodata as they can be defined as compelled products generated from geodata.

It has also shown that licensing models trends a concept of reliability different from free data concept itself.

In the end, it should exist a secure chain from producers to users, and that diversity of licensing models is an obstacle to it.

DE ended up suggesting that those licensing models should be harmonized in a common view to be presented to EU.

FR answered there's no time for an harmonization of IMP (PSI) as the schedule is too tight.

What can be achieved is to provide some view on the ongoing EU initiative.

The actual interpretation is different from the concept of free data providing.

Free providing can be understood as public data displaying.

Regarding to EU, data access should be free, so it might be considered that data used to build up charts could be available for free.

DK is sure that the pressure will press HOs to provide more and more free data, and that it remains important to provide survey covers and status as public information.

NL explained that NL politicians have already agreed on the PSI, but there's no specific law related to hydrography.

So if a common initiative is considered, NL could rely on it to build a specific law on Hydrography.

FR confessed not to be sure that track of exceptional case is good/appropriate. The lack of revenues from free data has to be justified to government.

NO added that data remain special because it's fresh, not only because it is processed data .

NL admitted preferring the terms « dataset we are accountable for » instead of « Raw data ».

JEPPESEN took the floor to explain data becomes free of charge as its quality decreases.

According de Mr. Bergmann, PSI has 2 aspects :

- data access for governments which is relevant;
- data access for private market which is a totally different story .

What needs to be ensured is that data will be for navigation at a certain quality as the updating scheme.

The industrial point of view is to find out how to provide data available in a formal way so it is more attractive to people to use fresh data but also to keep it with the necessary quality level we want so mariners will be more likely to use products.

The chair pointed out that PSI concept ensures the availability and accessibility of data no matter whom. The main question in stake is should we provide it for free or nearly for free ?

NL wondered if it is not the opportunity for industry to influence EU about the quality of data necessary.

JEPPESEN replied it is a common interest to provide EU with the correct view about the real stakes of hydrography.

FR agreed with JEPPESEN. High Quality data should be paid by industries at marginal costs, but they should not pay taxes on the products they'll make out of it.

DE added leisure markets will be more and more invaded by free data, so that free materials for leisure is a necessary mean in order to defend parallel production dedicated to professional shipping.

The chair suggested that a common approach should be aimed at, and then it could be implemented on a national scale to explain what is at stakes

The fact we exchange data and at the same time don't provide them through INSPIRE might jeopardize this balance.

The chair then suggested the following approach:

1. process on national ways to have get a national approach above HO's;
2. provide a joint approach to European Law Makers.

FR pursued by mentioning that data exchange agreements with rates between each other do exist.

Besides, EU don't rate for HO's and others rate for private.

To conclude, harmonization of data exchange is the main issue.

DE suggested that RENC could potentially work as harmonization platform.

UK pointed at the fact that there might be a problem with giving access to anybody, as countries like Bahamas won't pay any marginal costs with this approach.

The chair then explained three levels of action:

1. national lobby/explanation of national process between each others (in process);
2. raise all arguments in a more joint manner towards the EU commission in order to lobby Hydrography in the PSI framework as our activity relies mainly on data exchange between HO's.
3. work on a common shared licence agreement to be provided to administration and users.

Believing that the adoption of this common approach has to be endorsed by professionals as mentioned by DE, it is not sure that RENC is well suited to handle the whole issue as they are more dedicated to ENC's.

The chair recommended that the second level of action is the one that should be followed to raise the case of Hydrographic to the EU commission.

Also, the chair suggested this issue could become a topic for the EUM2WG to work on.

IHB commented that this work has to be focused on the economic benefits for state economy, as the expected market growth (1000 to 10 000%) would bring a potential gain would be four times the loss in fees. The use of free data could be of high interest for governments.

FR said that if it is related to navigation safety, it is an argument for HO's to provide in a easy manner data (updated geotiff or raster charts) to the private sector.

DE pointed at there might be a mix up between two things: incomes that we can be made and the set up of a business with that, which is more a private issue. One thing is to get revenues and the other to protect the chain of distribution.

The chair replied this is a WEND subject that should be discussed later.

The main issue is to protect consistency in data through data access, not protecting our own interest. There's no reasons to change to way information are exchanged now.

**@: Data access and licensing issues will be included to the scope of the EU2MWG to be discussed**

**with the EU commission.**

The chair concluded there is no need to go further in harmonization the actual way information are exchanged by now. He suggested reviewing NSHC conclusions related to this matter.

@ NSHC75 is to be considered as effected.

@ NSHC81 is to be considered as active, as this WG TOR is still necessary

@ NSHC91 is to be considered as active, as it is very important to keep EU commission informed about this WG work.

@ NSHC92 is to be considered as effected, as the MoU has been signed.

@ NSHC69 is to be considered as effected.

@ NSHC70 is to be considered as active, as the working group remains active

IHB : good to look at what MS ... (@70 related)

NO pointed at that as this Licensing matters WG has been inactive, it should be considered obsolete.

The chair answered that rules of exchange between HO's are also concerned by this WG, which makes it still relevant. Moreover, it's going to be reoriented on EU issues.

UK pointed out that there might not be the appropriated ressources from all HO's to take part of that WG.

FR said that in spite the fact this WG has been dormant for some years, it is still relevant to maintain on behalf of IHO M3 publication.

UK asked Baltic countries about their initiative on that topic in other RHCs.

SE replied there have not been any singificant work achieved on that issue.

The chair suggested that @70 will be maintained active as WG is reoriented on EU issues so it could be relevant to reinforce this WG and set up a new meeting in the scope of EU commission collaboration.

UK suggested welcoming the next meeting of this WG.

The chair asked the members about who would be willing to attend this meeting. UK is in.

NO pointed out the necessity to address this 70WG on EU issues, so the idea would be to combine 70WG and EUM2WG.

The chair pointed out calendar issues to merge both WG.

DK don't think this matter has to be dealt in a combined WG, and suggested inviting NSHC countries and other RHC countries.

FR asked if it really is a matter for all HO's in the world (IHO) or if it is a matter to dealt on a regional scale first and then to be shared with other RHC.

DK replied that some nations have to take the leads in that matters, and NSHC seems to be he most relevant.

NL agreed with the DK proposal.

SE agreed with that proposal, emphasizing on inviting other RHC representatives.

Then chair suggested to maintain the NSHC action @70 as active, and asked the members about who would participate to this WG.

UK, NL, DK, SE, NO and FR accepted to be part of that WG. Other RHCs chairs and members would be invited as well.

JEPPESEN reminded that what has been to be taken account which conditions market will be accepted.

UK agreed with Jeppessen point.

### **B3.2 EU Marine and Maritime policies Working Group (WG) report.**

This topic has been discussed previously with item #3.

### **B4 XVIIIth International Hydrographic Conference (IHC) decisions follow up.**

Chair précised that just 3 or 4 decisions of the IHC, related to RHCs will be enlightened.

#1 : According to IRCC, some performance indicators have to be taken into account by RHCs.

#10 : decision related to S-23 publication. Will be discussed with B9 item.

#12-13 : decisions regarding actions issued by WEND WG after their last meeting.



Those decisions will be discussed with WEND topics, in agenda's section D.

IHB added that some of those decisions have already started to be implemented.

Concerning performance indicators, letters to MS have been sent asking them to provide comments about the way to monitor the implementation of those performance indicators. The aim is to improve the monitoring presented during the conference by using the comments received. Working performance indicators will also be discussed with IRCC and HSSC committees to aim at a possible reduction and improvement of them, as IMO stands with 13-14 whereas IHO stands with around 40 indicators. It is only after compiling MS comments and reviews and the two committee's responses that the IHB will present its performance indicators monitoring plan will submitted to MS approval.

Moreover, Financial committee issue and S-23 issue are also being dealt by HB with progress.

Regarding the implementation of the strategic plan, and even though IRCC4 minutes are not issued yet, Chair has noted that an action regarding RHCs about providing values of SPI and WPI reached for 2012 and the projections for 2013.

## **C. HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICES AND STANDARDS**

### **C1 Review of relevant NSHC active conclusions**

Chair proposed to postpone NSHC conclusions review to the end of the meeting (item H)

### **C2 Report from North Sea Tidal WG**

FR presented the report of the North Sea Tidal WG, which last meeting occurred in Brest last February.

NL made a remark about WP18/01 task, pointing at that the objective box content of that task actually contains what should be mentioned in the three next boxes of that line.

NL also commented that the IHO tidal working group name mentioned in that report is no longer TWG, but TLWG as mentioned in its terms of reference.

The report will be then amended to take account of those comments.

Then NL made a comment about the possible lack of means for the BLAST project follow-up, asking what would the NSTWG deal with that constraint.

This question will be taken to the NSTWG Chair.

Chair added that during the last meeting of the conference, that WG has been tasked to formulate recommendations on the way forward to create a common and unique reference surface for the North Sea area related to the ellipsoid.

Indeed, products as High Resolution bathymetric models cannot be provided if there are still problems of discrepancies related to the reference surfaces

Orientations given to that WG are still important for our commission; MS have to take the priority of such tasks as well as their national ones.

Also, that task is a key issue regarding to European projects which aims to provide common data surfaces.

Even though having tidal common surface is hard task, it could a be good input for IHO and other regions, as thos problems can be met in other parts of the world.

Chair recommended to add the topic in the technical framework of EU Marine Knowledge initiative.

DE don't understand neither the need for an IHO website nor the work on a common xml format, which should not be considered as regional tasks. The standardization of tidal data exchange formats should be discussed within the S-100 framework.

FR asked if this topic should be discussed under the umbrella of HSSC, when the Tidal and Water Level WG will address the issue. FR found relevant DE's remark in that sense.

DE added that NSTWG should focus on its original task and not double IHO's work.

DK commented that the BLAST project provided a tool to calculate discrepancies, not a common surface reference.

DK also mentioned the lack of visibility about BLAST's next proposal.

### **C3 E-navigation**

NO presented its note about that topic and concluded by asking about any initiative from other HO's.

IHB precised IHO standards could be a good baseline for data access and services under the SOLAS framework in that matter. Moreover, IHO plays big part in IMO e-nav framework through IHO-IMO harmonization WG.

DE declared nothing has been achieved so far in e-nav.

Anyway, once S101 ENC is released then it will be question of software update of which immediate reaction to it can't be foreseen.

FR added since they're no production plan yet, it is more relevant to wait for S101 impact study by HSSC with a questionnaire survey expected to provide results with a strategy.

DK declared they's a need to harmonize between RHC before releasing the new S100-S101.

Jeppesen added that moving to S100-101 need to have compelling reasons, it has to be a tool that improves HO productivity. Systems have to be compatible with that, so that industry is working on it.

FR asked if it implies dual filled ECDIS S100-S57 or if it will be possible to switch directly to S100-101.

Jeppesen precised we have to be aware that new features/objects created by 101 won't be available. So do we start to create new systems? How navigators will deal with it ?

UK replied it needs to be done in junction with mariners in terms of transferring low quality ENC in new format. We're just scratching the surface of what happens when converting ENC on ECDIS.

It is really big task to undertake: switching to e-nav cannot be operated without taking lessons of ECDIS problems now.

SE mentioned there's a new project available about e-navigation. Website address will be addressed to MS.

NO wondered about which to deal with the fact that Mariners have 1st generation ECDIS.

DK stated the need to set up regional MSDI as key element of e-navigation.

Jeppesen added about the importance to realize what is the collaboration between data providers and how different data sources are displayed.

IHB declared there is no problem with HO's from TSMAD point of view. Optimistic point of view, even through some issues needs to be considered.

DE considered there will be a transition phase with a parallel production. MS should have a combined effort about it. From mariners point of view, S101-S57 should not be adverted on, as they don't care about format, only getting up date to date, and that it should not be too much information coming towards mariners.

UK precised mariners mostly complain about lack of engagement from HO's in ECDIs development.

UK wondered why we shouldn't ask EU for fundings and test benches.

IHB mentioned similar project will take place soon in Arctic, undertaken by NO.

NO added this project is focused on communication systems, which differs from benchmarking project like in Malacca Strait.

Chair then encouraged MS to take the questionnaire initiative into consideration. A specific questionnaire for data producers, industrials, mariners will be addressed.

### **C3.1 ACCSEAS project**

UK presented the ACCSEAS project and concluded by suggesting that NSHC to be represented at ACCSEAS next conference.

DK mentionned the existence of another project of the same kind called EFFICIENT SEAS, and then suggested NSHC should follow the progress of those projects in order to avoid conflicts, as both projects are financed by EU.

Chair then suggested as an NSHC action to address EU about the risk of having such similar projects on the same region.

NO added that EU could be addressed on a national level to be informed about such initiative to see if it conformes national views.

UK raised the point that as surveys means decrease, support to e-nav initiatives increase. EU needs to understand « that garbage in, garbage out » mechanism.

IHB pointed at the need to establish funds to achieve surveys in areas where they need to be conducted (and have not been by lack of means).

Chair stated that raising the awareness of EU about the importance of hydrographic surveying is a major stake for us.

On the other hand, Chair also suggested to postpone NO (items C10 and C11) and SE (items C7 and C8) presentations initially scheduled in the agenda to the last day of the conference. All MS accepted this reschedule.

#### **C4 ENC/Paper chart consistencies**

IHB raised the fact that there is a great number of unresolved issues, and asked if UK has had the leading role in resolving those issues since the last Circular letter.

UK stated MS should be working together on resolving those differences as soon as possible.

As dealing with those issues takes huge resources, there is a strong need to come to an understanding.

NO added that MS have to be careful about how those differences are understood. Indeed, ECDIS has room for improvements, and those differences can be displayed in a different way. Anyway, we should be careful on how it is displayed.

UK pointed at the fact that the main question is how to provide that information to the mariners.

FR appreciated UKHO efforts made on those issues, and asked UK if a special mechanism exists within UKHO to deal with those differences.

UK answered there is a process instituted that takes 6 months, which is too long to be adopted by IHO.

Chair stated that the problem will last as both formats will exist for a long time. So that it would be more responsible to set up a process and to increase it.

Chair suggested to set up an action to ask WEND WG to elaborate/review a process that could be inspired by UKHO process. UK will transmit its process to the WEND WG.

**@: Ask WEND WG to elaborate a process to deal with those consistencies based on UKHO process.**

UK added IHB should encourage feedback from mariners about those differences.

DE precised paper charts and ENCs cannot be kept identical, as it is not the same updating process for nautical information. This idea must be shared widely.

#### **C5 S101 impact study, XVIIIth IHC follow-up actions**

This item has already been discussed previously.

#### **C6 Symbols and Abbreviations used on Admiralty Electronic Charts (ENC)**

DE stated a feedback of UK initiative in INT1 group would be appreciated, as an equivalent of NP5012.

FR mentioned the existence of an action on writing an INT1 document for digital symbols within TSMAD.

UK answered NP5012 has been achieved in the purpose of training Mariners.

FR asked UK to explain the meanings of Admiralty Electronic charts. Jeppesen agreed with FR on asking that question.

UK answered those charts are just a matter of consistency, nothing more.

#### **C7 MONALISA project – Motorways and Electronic Navigation by Intelligence**

Rescheduled as agreed on NSHC30 Day 2 (presentation session).

#### **C8 Chemsea – CHEmical Munitions SEarch and Assess**

Rescheduled as agreed on NSHC30 Day 2 (presentation session).

#### **C9 Satellite bathymetry (SB)**

DK presented the topic throughout their explanatory note to the floor.

DE suggested that MS status update about this topic should be available on the IHO NSHC page.

UK reported some work achieved with SHOM and Australia.

FR stated this technology is matter of interest for lots of RHC, so that it would better having a standing agenda than a WG dealing with this topic.

UK precised it could be assessed through a EU project, and then suggested to set up an action to raise the topic of Satellite Bathymetry on EU lists of subjects.

NL commented this topic is a very interesting subject.

Chair raised the question about what we want to achieve, as every MS seems to be aware of the potential of Satellite Bathymetry. Now the next step has to be defined: sharing time can not be the only thing if we want to contribute on that project.

UK mentioned the existence of very poorly surveyed areas in the British Channel (Manche). I then could be used as test bed, as we could link Satellite Bathymetry with Sweden's ChemSEA project.

DE added the most important thing is to improve the sharing of informations about SB between MS.

NL suggested adding this topic to the Terms of Reference (TOR) of the Tidal WG (TWG).

DE precised it should on the contrary be addressed to the Re-survey WG.

Chair suggested to task DK to prepare a draft of conclusions about SB by the end of the conference.

Chair also added that setting up a face to face WG would not be relevant whereas sharing and exchange informations is still important.

---

- End of Day #1 session -

---

## **D. INTER-REGIONAL COORDINATION AND SUPPORT**

### **D1 Review of relevant NSHC active conclusions**

IHB opened that session by congratulating all MS for their efforts in cooperation, which is the theme of the next world hydrographic day.

Chair suggested to review all NSHC actions later with item H.

### **D2 Review of Inter Regional Coordination Committee (IRCC) actions and inputs for IRCC 5**

Chair pointed at the most relevant IRCC actions to be discussed by the commission:

IRCC7: Invitation of GEBCO guiding committee to the NSHC commission.

IRCC10: To provide RHC list of best practice: actually, the NSHC list of conclusions is a good practice, so it should be provided to IRCC as so. Chair suggested to set up an action as to provide IRCC with a list of best practices.

IRCC13: Chair suggested that WEND actions should be discussed with D3 item.

IRCC18: The report about work program tasks for the current year is be provided to the IRCC in the beginning of 2013 by next NSHC chair. This has to be raised as a new NSHC action.

The participation of industries to RHC is already effective within NSHC is raised as an NSHC action.

Last thing, the providing of performance indicators by January 2013 by RHCs.

NO wondered what is the ideas foreseen. Is it to provide values about RHCs to IRCC or to evaluate IHO work achievement?

Chair answered the real idea is to provide values about RHCs to IRCC and to define IHO strategic performance indicators (SPI).

FR precised that most of SPI are more relevant to other RHC than NSHC, for which there are easily reachable/achievable.

### **D3 World-wide Electronic Navigational Chart Database (WEND) and Regional ENC Coordination Centres (RENCs) cooperation**

Chair recalled the proposal of revision and amplification of WEND principles made during IRCC.

Chair suggested to raise a new action for MS to provide written comments about annexes B and C of the WEND proposal. MS agreed to validate the revision.

FR added that next WEND meeting is scheduled around next September 20th .

Chair stated that as this next meeting will come rather fast, a date to provide those comments within NSHC should be sorted out.

FR mentioned that as some statements were made by CA, US, DK about those comments, DK is highly recommends to provide those comments to the IRCC chair.

DK accepted to provide those comments by the end of August 2012, and will represent NHC region at WEND next September.

IHB stated those comments will be some value status for IHO work.

Chair declared that experienced HO's of NSHC can help bringing their comments/opinions about those annexes. As UK represents NSHC to WEND WG, all MS comments shall be addressed to UK, to the NSHC chair and to FR WEND Task Group representative.

IHB raised the question of the wording of those new principles of WEND.

FR precised it is something to be addressed at the IHO level.

IHB replied that new wordings provide technical guidelines to be applied by industrials. New text and old text need to be considered very carefully. The issue is more focused on territorial waters.

Chair stated that the problem is more focused on extra-territorial waters.

FR added those technical annexes are really necessary to provide guidelines to MS: the situation is getting worse as we have more and more ENC productions.

IHB said all solutions to solve those problems were ready in tokyo but has been narrowed by political issues.

UK stated there's really a problem of gaps and overlays with ENC, so that MS comments are highly expected.

#### **D4 Region D International Charting and Coordination WG report, including North Sea Electronic Navigational Chart (ENC) harmonization WG (NSEHWG) report**

UK presented the NSEHWG report to the commission.

Chair suggested that difficulties related to resolution of ENCs/CM discrepancies should be in the scope of this WG.

NL pointed at a kind of duplication between those 2 NSHC WG and technical experts meeting happening, and suggested to reconsider the exercise of 2WG.

FR agreed on the NL proposal.

Chair precised that the first WG establishes charting schemes whereas the second one is more specific to ENC encoding, which are totally different fonctions in fact.

As both WGs are chaired by UK, it is the call to decide if those 2 WG should be merged or not.

DK added have to decide what are our expectations for those 2 WG before considering merging them.

FR suggested to task UK to merge both WGs into a region D Chart Coordination WG with the same TORs.

#### **D5 C55 - XVIIIth IHC follow up actions**

Chair declared C55 should be amended in order to be helpful to National survey planning instead of being informative. The question of using areas of confidence is relevant to take benefits of dime sources from paper charts. Moreover, the amended C55 norm should contain geospatial information. AUS was tasked to propose the focuses of C55 including the national use of C55 providing elements about the sources of data. So far, all ENCs don't have areas of confidence

IHO is already collecting comments from AUS proposals in order to progress on new version of C55

AUS proposals are to be addressed to RHC chairs, so that NSHC members should provide their comments on those proposals. On the other hand, during the last IRCC was elected a new chair : Savi Naryana from India.

DK precised that a list of actions from the last IRCC meeting has been produced and should be addressed to every RHCs.

Chair suggested that to be adressed to previous IRCC chairs and to the IHB secretary to get that action list.

#### **D6 Governance principles for the definition and monitoring of national civilian hydrographic and charting program**

IE first presented their program, all informations about program available on their website.  
FR presented their hydrographic national planning (PNH) and emphasized that any companies performing surveys in EEZ FR is requested to send its data to SHOM. This procedure has been set up by The French Foreign Affairs Ministry (MAEE).  
NL mentioned their survey planning has already been provided to IHO, so invites FR and other MS to do so. In that way, Chair suggested to **maintain action NSHC90 as active**.

### **D7 Dover Strait survey strategy WG report**

BE presented their survey work achieved on the Belgium continental shelf.  
FR presented the *Pas de Calais* Survey Strategy, reminding MS in the meantime about the ongoing agreement between FR, UK, NL and BE and showing a draft of the new agreement.  
FR then requested concerned MS to fill up their own part of the agreement, and suggested to have this agreement approved for next NSHC conference.  
Chair suggested that comments by any MS would be addressed to France by end of October 2012 and raised the following new action: annexes to be completed by other MS before 31st NSHC conference.  
UK thanked FR for its work and proposal about that topic.

**@: Annexes of the draft agreement to be completed by other MS before MSHC31.**

### **D8 Re-survey WG report**

DE started by presenting the Re-survey WG report.  
The question of building up a GIS is raised, as it need inputs from MS. This is an ongoing question of the new chairman of this WG.  
Chair asked if this new GIS could be a cradle for new C55 information display.  
DE answered positively to that question, as C55 is still unclear, this WG is focused on his work first.  
NL understands the fears of some MS to display their status of survey achievements (executed plan) ; it shall be a common share between MS regarding to transparency.  
Chair added that comments from AUS about new C55 will be helpful before asking the floor if there would be any candidate to chair this WG. NL accepted to take the chair at the next WG session.

### **D9 Regional Inventory on Limits and Names of the Sea and revision of maritime boundaries, XVIIIth IHC follow up**

SE presented the BSHC draft recommendations for harmonizing names of sub-areas of the Baltic Sea.  
DE presented their explanatory note on this item and proposed to draft a document about this matter.  
NL declared to be in favor of it, as it matches with the EU Inspire directive to provide names.  
UK also agreed with it, and precised it has to be an NSHC doc (only).  
NO answered positively to the DE proposal, and added that the IHO website should be the best platform to advertise on it.  
DK replied they don't want the IHB connection with this initiative.  
FR stated it doesn't want to open Pandora's box, as the regional approach has been refused by CHI. FR is in favor of a regional guide of names and limits as done by AUS.  
DE precised that this initiative has to be totally separated from S23.  
FR agreed with DE that it can be a leverage on EU Inspire, but MS are not mandated for such a work. FR asked if that same energy put in that matter is the same used on behalf of mariners safety.  
FR precised it might lead to some complications as regional approach was refused by IHO, so it will go through a process that was not accepted by IHO.  
NO declared the regional approach was refused as all MS felt like hostages with Far east situations.  
NO agreed with DE proposal and said it's way to lower pressure and to go on that matter.  
IHB confessed this matter was a very difficult task to chair. In the end, it has been decided that S23 would not go further. Anyway IHB can not prevent RHC with working on a regional inventory as they're not related to IHO. In the end, RHC/HO's will have to address/inform IHO about such an initiative.  
Chair pointed that the non existing official statutes of NSHC makes work on regional approaches possible.

Chair suggested to raise a new action to suggest DE to provide a draft of their proposal and circulate it in order to have other MS opinion by end of year.

DE confessed that providing NSHC domain will reflect much more the work achieved on that matter.

FR said it will have to consult MAEE about the set up of a regional approach WG, as it is above SHOM's responsibility.

DE refused to redraft, declaring it has to appear in the conclusions.

FR asked about how to add it to conclusions of NSHC.

UK suggested it could be worded briefly in the conclusions of NSHC.

Chair stated that a change of TOR in conclusions is not enough.

IHB proposed MS to draft the TOR of the DE proposed WG and submit it to MS with a wording in NSHC conclusions.

Chair agreed with IHB proposals, but precised the conclusions have to be worked out in the end. Chair then asked the floor about who wants to be in WG and who is ready to chair it.

IE pointed at the fact Foreign Affairs has the last word on that topic so Hos needs time to consult their Foreign Offices.

UK agreed to become a member of that WG.

BE accepted too, as they have a juridic expert (sea law) that can join the WG.

DK answered positively for the WG, precising all MS have to be part, as it makes it more relevant.

NL agreed with DK comment, such as NO.

NL suggested FR could chair this WG..

FR answered there is no resources to dedicate to that WG chair.

DK suggested NSHC should wait and see the achievement of the BSHC approach, which makes 2 more years to wait. DE, NO and SE agreed with DK.

#### **D10 to D13**

Chair asked the floor for additional comments about those items.

No comments were made by any MS.

### **E. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

#### **E1 Violations of copyright, etc. of Danish charts**

DK presented their note about the NV Lawsuit by DKHO.

DE produced evidences against same issues with NV by highlighting similar mistakes between DE and NV charts (NV took the same mistakes from them actually).

FR asked about the law framework in EU laws.

Chair announced that existing conclusions status evolution will be added and addressed with draft minutes of NSHC30.

### **F. ELECTION OF NEW CHAIRMAN**

Evert Flier (NO) was elected as new NSHC chairman.

Evert Flier first acknowledged IGA Bruno Frachon for the way he handled this 30<sup>th</sup> NSHC commission, and thanked warmly Admiral Maratos for his help and support throughout what was the last NSHC conference of his carrier, wishing him fair winds.

### **G. PLACE AND DATE OF NEXT CONFERENCE**

All MS agreed that the next conference will be held in NL.

FR suggested that IE hosts NSHC32 in 2016.

DE advised some more time should be given between NSHC32 and CHIE in 2014.

UK made a proposal of having NSHC conference annually.

DE declared to be more in favor of a 2 years rate.

NL stated it prefers to spend energy and time in WG rather than in Hydrographic Commissions, so SE agreed with it.

NO suggested the June timeframe would be preferable regarding the CHIE shedule.

FR considered it is a hard work to be made by WGs incompatible with a back to back conference with CHIE.

DE agreed with NO preferences and its proposal.  
NL asked when CHIE will be scheduled. IHB answered October of 2014.  
Then NL stated NSHC31 should then be held in June 2014.

## **H. APPROVAL OF 30<sup>TH</sup> NSHC LIST OF ACTIONS**

FR presented the NSHC conclusions draft and the proposed status update for the existing ones.  
DK presented their draft action about Satellite Bathymetry to be added to the actions list draft:

*The commission took note of the information presented by Denmark. The commission recognised the need to focus on new technology and especially to have a focus on the expected future value of satellite bathymetry and airborne bathymetry.*

*Therefore the commission agreed to add a new agenda item to the standard NSHC agenda dealing with airborne and satellite bathymetry.*

*Given the current situation and expectations for the future development of airborne and satellite bathymetry a need for closer cooperation between organizations was identified. It was agreed that the establishment of a Satellite Bathymetry Working Group could be an appropriate activity of the NSHC though further consideration and investigation would be required in order to identify the most suitable and appropriate way to proceed.*

*Therefore the commission agreed to discuss short and long term goals and to evaluate on how to proceed with airborne and satellite bathymetry at the next NSHC 31th Conference in 2014. The commission also agreed to exchange relevant information dealing with airborne and satellite bathymetry.*

*All NSHC Members was encouraged to participate and present input papers to the new agenda item and in general to contribute to the work with airborne and satellite bathymetry.*

*Draft Action items decided at the 30th NSHC Meeting:*

*➔ To add a new agenda item to the standard NSHC agenda dealing with airborne and satellite bathymetry.*

*➔ At the next NSHC Conference in 2014, to discuss short and long term goals and to evaluate on how to proceed with airborne and satellite bathymetry.*

DK also suggested that some Satellite Bathymetry documents could be posted on IHO NSHC page.

## **G. CLOSING REMARKS**

NO stated it was a very good conference well lead by FR, lots of work to be achieved by WGs.

NO also added that MS should not hesitate to report any slow-down on any actions.

FR acknowledged all MS for their contributions, and thanked to NO for organizing this 30<sup>th</sup> NSHC Conference which will be recalled for long time thanks to its places, menus and visits.

FR also thanked Admiral Maratos for his work and contribution for the last 40 years.

In the mean time, IGA Frachon stated: *“As far as I am concerned [...] I would like to thank Admiral Maratos on behalf of the whole Hydrographic community.”*

Adm Maratos thanked all members and confessed he had enjoyed participating to this 30<sup>th</sup> conference adding he has always learned a lot of contacts with HO's.

FR ended the session by acknowledging industrial stakeholders for attending the conference.



### 30<sup>th</sup> NSHC: Conclusions of the North Sea Hydrographic Commission

No	Title/Subject	Current Status	Suggestion
1	<a href="#">Statutes for the North Sea Hydrographic Commission</a>	Effectuated	
2	<a href="#">Publication of Fisheries Charts</a>	Effectuated	
3	<a href="#">Necessity of survey work outside territorial waters</a>	Obsolete	
4	<a href="#">Gravity and geo-magnetic measurements at sea</a>	Obsolete	
5	<a href="#">Amendment of the Statutes</a>	Active	Effectuated
6	<a href="#">North sea Surveys Progress Chart</a>	Obsolete	
7	<a href="#">Policy of expunging wrecks from charts</a>	Active	Active
8	<a href="#">Co tidal lines and Range Chart</a>	Obsolete	
9	<a href="#">Survey Priorities Chart</a>	Obsolete	
10	<a href="#">Legal Status of the International Hydrographic Bureau</a>	Obsolete	
11	<a href="#">Conclusions reflecting decisions of the NSHC</a>	Active	Active
12	<a href="#">Position of light buoy S2</a>	Obsolete	
13	<a href="#">Symbol and note regarding deep-draught routes</a>	Obsolete	
14	<a href="#">Symbol for mechanical sweeping of wrecks</a>	Obsolete	
15	<a href="#">Submarine Cables in Fisheries Charts</a>	Active	Active
16	<a href="#">IMO matters</a>	Active	Active
17	<a href="#">Joint use of electronic position fixing transmitters</a>	Active	Obsolete
18	<a href="#">NSHC Sub-Committee on International Charts</a>	Obsolete	
19	<a href="#">Dept information in metres and decimetres in charts</a>	Obsolete	
20	<a href="#">The setting up of a World Wide Radio Warning System</a>	Obsolete	
21	<a href="#">Group of Tidal Experts</a>	Obsolete	
22	<a href="#">Deep draught passage east of Indefatigable Banks</a>	Obsolete	
23	<a href="#">Governmental consultancy of Hydrographic Offices</a>	Obsolete	
24	<a href="#">Depiction in charts of IMCO separation schemes and routes</a>	Obsolete	
25	<a href="#">Inventories and exchange of computer programs</a>	Obsolete	
26	<a href="#">Training in the UK Hydrographic School</a>	Effectuated	
27	<a href="#">Proposal to the IMCO of a surveyed, specified VLCC route</a>	Obsolete	
28	<a href="#">Resurveying of critical areas</a>	Active	Active
29	<a href="#">INT Chart differences, producer versus printer nations</a>	Obsolete	
30	<a href="#">Definition of Area 1 in RaNaWa</a>	Obsolete	
31	<a href="#">Deep draught shipping versus seabed exploitation activities</a>	Active	Obsolete

32	<a href="#">DW Routes</a>	Obsolete	
33	<a href="#">Membership of France</a>	Effectuated	
34	<a href="#">NSHC Instruction Officers at RN Hydrographic School</a>	Active	Active
35	<a href="#">Survey classification reflected in Survey Progress Chart NSHC 1</a>	Obsolete	
36	<a href="#">Definition of "Adequate Comprehensive Survey" and its use on North Sea Survey Progress Charts NSHC 1 and NSHC 2</a>	Obsolete	
37	<a href="#">The continued use of DR 1 and S2 DW routes</a>	Obsolete	
38	<a href="#">Membership of Belgium</a>	Effectuated	
39	<a href="#">Radio frequencies for surveying purposes</a>	Effectuated	
40	<a href="#">Radio Navigational Warnings</a>	Effectuated	
41	<a href="#">Copyright of nautical charts and publications</a>	Obsolete	
42	<a href="#">Hydrographic survey of deep-water (DW) routes -use of side-scan sonar</a>	Obsolete	
43	<a href="#">Plan for completion of scheming for the portion of the coasts of the NSHC area not yet schemed at large scale</a>	Obsolete	
44	<a href="#">Negative Tidal Surges Warning Service</a>	Active	Active
45	<a href="#">Exploratory drilling in the area of the Texel traffic Separation Scheme</a>	Active	Obsolete
46	<a href="#">Passage of VLCC's south and Southwest bound through the North Sea and Dover Strait to the English Channel</a>	Active	Active
47	<a href="#">Working Groups on Electronic Chart Display Systems</a>	Effectuated	
48	<a href="#">Establishment of an ad hoc NSHC Working Group on Electronic Chart Display System</a>	Obsolete	
49	<a href="#">Course in Nautical Cartography at the ITC, the Netherlands</a>	Obsolete	
50	<a href="#">Under keel allowance for deep draught vessels in the Dover Strait and Approaches</a>	Active	Obsolete
51	<a href="#">List of Radio location Systems in use in the North Sea</a>	Obsolete	
52	<a href="#">Progress report: NSICS</a>	Obsolete	
53	<a href="#">Evaluation of the INT Chart</a>	Effectuated	
54	<a href="#">Regional Electronic Chart Base</a>	Obsolete	
55	<a href="#">Regional Electronic Chart Base - Administrative arrangements</a>	Obsolete	
56	<a href="#">NSHC Ad hoc Working Group on INT charts and NSHC ECDS</a>	Active	Obsolete
57	<a href="#">International Charts - INT chart financial regulations</a>	Obsolete	
58	<a href="#">Standardization of Notices to Mariners and Lights Lists</a>	Effectuated	
59	<a href="#">INT Chart Specifications: National Symbology on INT Charts</a>	Active	Active
60	<a href="#">Standardization of Sailing Directions</a>	Effectuated	

61	<a href="#">Data Exchange Format for Electronic Chart Data</a>	Obsolete	
62	<a href="#">International Charts - Technical Resolutions</a>	Obsolete	
63	<a href="#">Position Fixing and Hydrographic Surveying Technique</a>	Obsolete	
64	<a href="#">Bilateral Arrangements Between Hydrographic Offices</a>	Effectuated	
65	<a href="#">Reliability of chart</a>	Active	Effectuated
66	<a href="#">Training</a>	Active	Effectuated (Lithuania?)
67	<a href="#">System of Election of IHB Directing Committee</a>	Obsolete	
68	<a href="#">Statutes of the North Sea Hydrographic Commission</a>	Effectuated	
69	<a href="#">Copyright matters relating to commercial publishers</a>	Active	Effectuated
70	<a href="#">Working Group on Copyright and Pricing Matters</a>	Active	Active
71	<a href="#">Principles and procedures for exchange of data</a>	Effectuated	
72	<a href="#">Report of Tidal Working Group</a>	Active	Active
73	<a href="#">Adoption of WGS84 as horizontal datum for nautical charts</a>	Active	Obsolete
74	<a href="#">NSHC Working Group on Consistent Survey Policies</a>	Obsolete	
75	<a href="#">Co-operation Strategy for European HO's</a>	Active	Effectuated
76	<a href="#">Report of the Working Group on copyright and Pricing related Matters</a>	Active	Active
77	<a href="#">Small craft safety</a>	Active	Active
78	<a href="#">Digital equivalents meeting SOLAS chapter V carriage requirement</a>	Active	Obsolete
79	<a href="#">Oslo-Paris Commission request</a>	Active	Active
80	<a href="#">S-55 Data-base</a>	Active	Obsolete
81	<a href="#">To form a EU Marine &amp; Maritime Policies WG</a>	Active	Active
82	<a href="#">NSHC Statutes</a>	Active	Obsolete
83	<a href="#">North Sea ENC Harmonization WG</a>	Active	Active
84	<a href="#">NSHC recommendations to WEND WG</a>	Active	Obsolete
85	<a href="#">International charting coordination working group (ICCWG)</a>	Active	Active
86	<a href="#">NSHC cooperation with Arctic Regional Hydrographic Commission (ARHC)</a>	Active	Effectuated
87	<a href="#">North Sea Tidal WG</a>	Active	Active
88	<a href="#">Dover Strait Survey Strategy WG</a>	Active	Active
89	<a href="#">NSHC Re-survey WG</a>	Active	Active
90	<a href="#">National civilian hydrographic and charting program</a>	Active	Active
91	<a href="#">EU marine and maritime policy WG</a>	Active	Active
92	<a href="#">MOU between EU and IHO</a>	Active	Effectuated

93	<a href="#">Status of the ratification of the protocol of amendments</a>	Active	
94	<a href="#">IHO and European Union (EU) cooperation and policy</a>	Active	
95	<a href="#">Working Group on Copyright and Pricing related matters.</a>	Active	
96	<a href="#">ENCs/Charts inconsistencies</a>	Active	
97	<a href="#">Re-survey Working Group</a>	Active	
98	<a href="#">Regional Hydrographic Commissions' best practices</a>	Active	
99	<a href="#">NSHC work program tasks</a>	Active	
100	<a href="#">Participation of industries to RHC</a>	Active	
101	<a href="#">Revision and amplifications of WEND Principles</a>	Active	
102	<a href="#">Dover Strait Survey Strategy Plan</a>	Active	

DRAFT

**List of conclusions from NSHC 30<sup>th</sup> conference - Ålesund - June 2012**

NSHC Conclusion number	LIST	RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
93	<p><b>Status of the ratification of the protocol of amendments</b></p> <p><i>Considering the fact that over the seven last years, only 36 approvals over the 38 needed have been collected, and so in spite of the two circular letters provided each year to member states about notification status;</i></p> <p><i><u>NSHC members agreed on</u> the principle that the IHB should provide an executive summary precisising the role and the benefits of the IHO protocol of amendments.</i></p> <p><i>This summary shall be addressed to countries which have not approved the protocol so far.</i></p>	IHB	
94	<p><b>IHO and European Union (EU) cooperation and policy</b></p> <p><i>Noting that European Commission urges European Hydrographic Offices (EU HOs) to organize themselves to meet EU requirements;</i></p> <p><i>considering that HOs do have an expertise regarding the use of data worth to be shared in the scope of cooperation with the EU;</i></p> <p><i>considering that HOs have to be active in the scope of cooperation with EU,</i></p> <p><i><u>The NSHC members recommends that:</u></i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>- The NSHC European Marine &amp; Maritime Working Group (EUM2WG) will continue to act as focal point for EU policy matters;</i></li> </ul>	EU/FR/IHB/NSHC members/Chair	

**List of conclusions from NSHC 30<sup>th</sup> conference - Ålesund - June 2012**

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>HOs</b> to confirm their willingness to participate in this EUM2WG, and update POCs (<b>end of July 2012</b>);</li> <li>- <b>Chair of the WG</b> to plan a formal meeting with DG Mare (<b>October 2012</b>), - to be announced by the IHB by CL (iaw MoU);</li> <li>- <b>FR</b> to identify list of IHO and EU events of mutual interest (Dec. 2012);</li> <li>- by <b>Jan. 2013</b>, to identify EU projects (Marine Knowledge, etc.) that can be supported by a consortium of HOs;</li> <li>- <b>FR</b> to prepare a roadmap for the EUM2WG by <b>April 2013</b>, circulation between IHO MS;</li> <li>- <b>WHD, EU-IHO</b> workshop to present a « formal proposal » (<b>June 2013</b>);</li> <li>- The <b>NSHC chair</b> will report about the status of this EU cooperation to the IRCC;</li> <li>- The evolution of the Public Sector Information Directive &amp; related licensing issues become a EUM2WG matter within the EU cooperation scope;</li> <li>- The question of a tidal common reference surface is included within the EU cooperation framework (<b>TWG Chair</b>);</li> <li>- <b>NSHC Chair/IHB</b> to address EC about the risk of having similar projects in the same region (as e-navigation orientated ACCSEAS and EFFICIENT SEAS projects both financed by EU);</li> <li>- Satellite bathymetry as an enabler for capacity development should be added as a topic to be discussed within the EU cooperation scope (<b>Chair/IHB</b>).</li> <li>-</li> </ul>		
95	<p><b>Working Group on Copyright and Pricing related matters.</b></p> <p><i>Considering that the importance of licensing issues within the EU gives this topic the legitimacy the be considered as a main NSHC issue;</i></p> <p><i>Recognizing that the actual <b>Copyright and Pricing Matters Working Group's</b> Terms of Reference should be revised accordingly;</i></p> <p><b><u>NSHC members recommend</u></b> that complements and goals of that WG must be redefined in order to clarify its framework.</p>	UK	
96	<b>ENCs/Charts inconsistencies</b>	UK/WEND	

**List of conclusions from NSHC 30<sup>th</sup> conference - Ålesund - June 2012**

	<p><i>Considering the occurrence of unresolved issues concerning ENC's and paper charts;</i></p> <p><i>Recognizing that it takes significant resources to resolve those issues and that member states need to work in a common effort under a unique process;</i></p> <p><i>All NSHC members agreed on that <b>WEND WG</b> should be asked to elaborate an overall process in order to solve such inconsistencies, based on the review of the existing <b>UK</b> process.</i></p>		
97	<p><b>Re-survey Working Group</b></p> <p><i>The commission took note of the information presented by Denmark. The commission recognised the need to focus on new technology and especially to have a focus on the expected future value of satellite bathymetry and airborne bathymetry.</i></p> <p><i>Therefore the commission agreed to add a new agenda item to the standard NSHC agenda dealing with airborne and satellite bathymetry.</i></p> <p><i>Given the current situation and expectations for the future development of airborne and satellite bathymetry a need for closer cooperation between organizations was identified. It was agreed that the Re-survey Working Group's scope could be an appropriate activity of the NSHC though further consideration and investigation would be required in order to identify the most suitable and appropriate way to proceed.</i></p> <p><i>Therefore the commission agreed to discuss short and long term goals and to evaluate on how to proceed with airborne and satellite bathymetry at the next NSHC 31th Conference in 2014. The commission also agreed to exchange relevant information dealing with airborne and satellite bathymetry.</i></p> <p><i>All NSHC Members was encouraged to participate and present input papers to the new</i></p>	NSHC Chair/WG Chair	

**List of conclusions from NSHC 30<sup>th</sup> conference - Ålesund - June 2012**

	<p><i>agenda item and in general to contribute to the work with airborne and satellite bathymetry.</i></p> <p><u>All NSHC members decide:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>that satellite bathymetry should be added to the TOR of the Re-survey WG.</i></li> <li>• <i>to add a new agenda item to the standard NSHC agenda dealing with airborne and satellite bathymetry.</i></li> <li>• <i>at the next NSHC Conference in 2014 to discuss short and long term goals and to evaluate on how to proceed with airborne and satellite bathymetry.</i></li> </ul>		
98	<p><b>Regional Hydrographic Commissions' best practices</b></p> <p><i>Considering the decision concerning RHCs' best practices issued during the 4<sup>th</sup> Inter Regional Coordination Committee (IRCC) in June 2012;</i></p> <p><u>NSHC members agreed on that a list of NSHC's best practices shall be provided to the IRCC.</u></p>	NSHC Chair	
99	<p><b>NSHC work program tasks</b></p> <p><i>In accordance with one of the decision issued during the 4<sup>th</sup> Inter Regional Coordination Committee (IRCC) in June 2012;</i></p> <p><u>The NSHC commission decided that a report progress of relevant tasks is to be provided to the IHO by NSHC Chair by beginning of 2013.</u></p>	NSHC Chair	January 31st, 2013
100	<p><b>Participation of industries to RHC</b></p> <p><i>In accordance with one of the decision issued during the 4<sup>th</sup> Inter Regional Coordination</i></p>	NSHC Chair	Permanent



**List of conclusions from NSHC 30<sup>th</sup> conference - Ålesund - June 2012**

	<p><i>Committee (IRCC) in June 2012;</i></p> <p><i>All NSHC members agreed on that industry stakeholders' participation to Regional Hydrographic Commissions is to be considered.</i></p>		
101	<p><b>Revision and amplifications of WEND Principles</b></p> <p><i>Considering the discussion about the WEND PRO2 proposal that took place during the 4<sup>th</sup> Inter Regional Coordination Committee (IRCC) in June 2012;</i></p> <p><i>NSHC members agreed on to provide written comments concerning annexes B and C of the WEND PRO2 proposal.</i></p>	NSHC Chair	
102	<p><b>Dover Strait Survey Strategy Plan</b></p> <p><i>Considering that all concerned member states agreed on the convention issued by France and presented during the 30<sup>th</sup> NSHC conference,</i></p> <p><i>All NSHC members recommend those member states should complete the annexes of the convention project.</i></p>	UK, NL, BE	December 31st, 2012

## Conclusions of the North Sea Hydrographic Commission

Conclusion No.	Place and year of adoption	Status	Deadline	Responsible
93	Ålesund, Norway, 2012	Active		IHB

### *Status of the ratification of the protocol of amendments*

*Considering the fact that over the seven last years, only 36 approvals over the 38 needed have been collected, and so in spite of the two circular letters provided each year to member states about notification status,*

*NSHC members agreed on the principle that the IHB should provide an executive summary precisising the role and the benefits of the IHO protocol of amendments.*

*This summary shall be addressed to countries which haven't approved the protocol so far.*

## Conclusions of the North Sea Hydrographic Commission

Conclusion No.	Place and year of adoption	Status	Deadline	Responsible
94	Ålesund, Norway, 2012	Active	See below	EU/FR/IHB/ NSHC members/Chair

### *IHO and European Union (EU) cooperation and policy*

*Noting that European Commission urges European Hydrographic Offices (EU HOs) to organize themselves to meet EU requirements;  
considering that HOs do have an expertise regarding the use of data worth to be shared in the scope of cooperation with the EU;  
considering that HOs have to be active in the scope of cooperation with EU,*

#### *The NSHC members recommends that:*

- *The NSHC European Marine & Maritime Working Group (EUM2WG) will continue to act as focal point for EU policy matters;*
- *HOs to confirm their willingness to participate in this EUM2WG, and update POCs (end of July 2012);*
- *Chair of the WG to plan a formal meeting with DG Mare (October 2012), - to be announced by the IHB by CL (iaw MoU);*
- *FR to identify list of IHO and EU events of mutual interest (Dec. 2012);*
- *by Jan. 2013, to identify EU projects (Marine Knowledge, etc.) that can be supported by a consortium of HOs;*
- *FR to prepare a roadmap for the EUM2WG by April 2013, circulation between IHO MS;*
- *WHD, EU-IHO workshop to present a « formal proposal » (June 2013);*
- *The NSHC chair will report about the status of this EU cooperation to the IRCC;*
- *The evolution of the Public Sector Information Directive & related licensing issues become a EUM2WG matter within the EU cooperation scope;*
- *The question of a tidal common reference surface is included within the EU cooperation framework (TWG Chair);*
- *NSHC Chair/IHB to address EC about the risk of having similar projects in the same region (as e-navigation orientated ACCSEAS and EFFICIENT SEAS projects both financed by EU);*
- *Satellite bathymetry as an enabler for capacity development should be added as a topic to be discussed within the EU cooperation scope (Chair/IHB).*

## Conclusions of the North Sea Hydrographic Commission

Conclusion No.	Place and year of adoption	Status	Deadline	Responsible
95	Ålesund, Norway, 2012	Active		UK

### *Working Group on Copyright and Pricing related matters.*

*Considering that the importance of licensing issues within the EU gives this topic the legitimacy to be considered as a main NSHC issue;*

*Recognizing that the actual **Copyright and Pricing Matters Working Group's** Terms of Reference should be revised accordingly;*

*NSHC members recommend that complements and goals of that WG must be redefined in order to clarify its framework.*

## Conclusions of the North Sea Hydrographic Commission

Conclusion No.	Place and year of adoption	Status	Deadline	Responsible
96	Ålesund, Norway, 2012	Active		UK/WEND

### *ENCs/Charts inconsistencies*

*Considering the occurrence of unresolved issues concerning ENCs and paper charts;*

*Recognizing that it takes significant resources to resolve those issues and that member states need to work in a common effort under a unique process;*

*All NSHC members agreed on that **WEND WG** should be asked to elaborate an overall process in order to solve such inconsistencies, based on the review of the existing **UK** process.*

## Conclusions of the North Sea Hydrographic Commission

Conclusion No.	Place and year of adoption	Status	Deadline	Responsible
97	Ålesund, Norway, 2012	Active		NSHC Chair/ WG Chair

### *Re-survey Working Group*

*The commission took note of the information presented by Denmark. The commission recognised the need to focus on new technology and especially to have a focus on the expected future value of satellite bathymetry and airborne bathymetry.*

*Therefore the commission agreed to add a new agenda item to the standard NSHC agenda dealing with airborne and satellite bathymetry.*

*Given the current situation and expectations for the future development of airborne and satellite bathymetry a need for closer cooperation between organizations was identified. It was agreed that the Re-survey Working Group's scope could be an appropriate activity of the NSHC though further consideration and investigation would be required in order to identify the most suitable and appropriate way to proceed.*

*Therefore the commission agreed to discuss short and long term goals and to evaluate on how to proceed with airborne and satellite bathymetry at the next NSHC 31th Conference in 2014. The commission also agreed to exchange relevant information dealing with airborne and satellite bathymetry.*

*All NSHC Members was encouraged to participate and present input papers to the new agenda item and in general to contribute to the work with airborne and satellite bathymetry.*

#### *All NSHC members decide:*

- that satellite bathymetry should be added to the TOR of the Re-survey WG.*
- to add a new agenda item to the standard NSHC agenda dealing with airborne and satellite bathymetry.*
- at the next NSHC Conference in 2014 to discuss short and long term goals and to evaluate on how to proceed with airborne and satellite bathymetry.*

## Conclusions of the North Sea Hydrographic Commission

Conclusion No.	Place and year of adoption	Status	Deadline	Responsible
98	Ålesund, Norway, 2012	Active		NSHC Chair

### *Regional Hydrographic Commissions' best practices*

*Considering the decision concerning RHCs' best practices issued during the 4<sup>th</sup> Inter Regional Coordination Committee (IRCC) in June 2012;*

*NSHC members agreed on that a list of NSHC's best practices shall be provided to the IRCC.*

## Conclusions of the North Sea Hydrographic Commission

Conclusion No.	Place and year of adoption	Status	Deadline	Responsible
99	Ålesund, Norway, 2012	Active	31/01/2013	NSHC Chair

### *NSHC work program tasks*

*In accordance with one of the decision issued during the 4<sup>th</sup> Inter Regional Coordination Committee (IRCC) in June 2012;*

*The NSHC commission decided that a report progress of relevant tasks is to be provided to the IHO by NSHC Chair by **beginning of 2013.***



## Conclusions of the North Sea Hydrographic Commission

Conclusion No.	Place and year of adoption	Status	Deadline	Responsible
100	Ålesund, Norway, 2012	Active	Permanent	NSHC Chair

### *Participation of industries to Regional Hydrographic Commissions*

*In accordance with one of the decision issued during the 4<sup>th</sup> Inter Regional Coordination Committee (IRCC) in June 2012;*

*All NSHC members agreed on that industry stakeholders' participation to Regional Hydrographic Commissions is to be considered.*

## Conclusions of the North Sea Hydrographic Commission

Conclusion No.	Place and year of adoption	Status	Deadline	Responsible
101	Ålesund, Norway, 2012	Active		NSHC Chair

### *Revision and amplifications of WEND Principles*

*Considering the discussion about the WEND PRO2 proposal that took place during the 4<sup>th</sup> Inter Regional Coordination Committee (IRCC) in June 2012;*

*NSHC members agreed on to provide written comments concerning annexes B and C of the WEND PRO2 proposal.*

DRAFT

## Conclusions of the North Sea Hydrographic Commission

Conclusion No.	Place and year of adoption	Status	Deadline	Responsible
102	Ålesund, Norway, 2012	Active	31/12/2012	UK/NL/BE

### *Dover Strait Survey Strategy Plan*

*Considering that all concerned member states agreed on the convention issued by France and presented during the 30<sup>th</sup> NSHC conference,*

*All NSHC members recommend those member states should complete the annexes of the convention project.*