



# Final Report

2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting of the RSAHC Tehran 2-3 May 2006

## Report

**Agenda Item 1: Opening**

The meeting opened at 0830 with speeches by the Chairman of RSAHC, Mr. Ali Estiri (Annex 1), HE the Minister of Roads and Transportation (Annex 2), the Director of the IHB (Annex 3) and the ROPME Co-ordinator (Annex 4).

There was excellent media coverage of the opening ceremonies in both Farsi and English.

**Agenda Items 2, 3 and 4**

The Chairman welcomed all the participants and explained that the UKHO were not able to participate in this meeting due to visa difficulties. He also explained the administrative arrangements and the availability of Internet services for all participants.

IHB Director, Captain Gorziglia welcomed all participants and added that the IHB were present to facilitate the meeting, note the decisions taken and assist as best as possible.

The Provisional Agenda (Annex 5) was accepted and the draft time table agreed (Annex 6).

**Agenda Item 4. Action items from the previous meeting.**

The Chairman summarised the action items from the previous meeting as follows (report on the action items is at Annex 7):

The report by India as INT Chart Region J coordinator was discussed at the 1<sup>st</sup> RSAHC meeting and it had been decided to form a sub-region "J2" to cover the ROPME Sea Area. This had subsequently been changed to become a new Region I and the Islamic Republic of Iran had agreed to act as the coordinator.

Pakistan has agreed to be a full member of the RSAHC.

Training issues would be discussed under Agenda item 8.

Production of INT charts and ENCs; this will be considered under agenda item 9.

Oman brought the meeting's attention to the extraordinary meeting which was held during the IHC in 2002. The IHB reported that whilst it was aware of the meeting it had no details / records of the matters discussed. Members present reported that the extraordinary meeting had discussed the geographical area of the RSAHC and that the IHC had recognised the RSAHC and approved the refined limits of INT Chart

Regions I and J. An informal meeting had taken place during the 3<sup>rd</sup> EIHC in 2005 and this had been fundamental in achieving this 2<sup>nd</sup> formal meeting of the RSAHC.

Following the discussion of the action items from the 1<sup>st</sup> meeting, Kuwait raised the matter of participation by Iraq in the RSAHC. The coordinator of ROPME, Dr. Mohammadi, explained that Iraq had been suspended from ROPME following the invasion of Kuwait in the 1990's but that it now had observer status. Recently Iraq has participated in the Council of Ministers of ROPME. The director of IHB reported that Iraq has not applied for IHO membership and therefore should they apply to join the RSAHC they would only be able to participate as an Associate Member.

#### **Agenda item 5: Review of the Statutes**

It was suggested, given the 5 year interval since the last meeting of the RSAHC and the experience gained with other RHCs during that period, that some wording in the Statutes of the RSAHC may need revision and in particular:

- frequency of meetings
- election of a Vice Chairman.
- the time at which a newly elected Chairman assumes office. (The current point of 6 months before next meeting has caused problems and has been changed by other RHCs).
- the host country and the Chairman , etc...

The IHB provided some history of the development of Statutes by the NSHC. This model had provided the basis for the Statutes developed by other RHCs which had in some cases, subsequently been modified to better meet the specific requirements and changing circumstances of a particular region. IHO Technical Resolution T1.3, which is included as Annex A to the RSAHC Statutes, had been amended and this would have to be reflected in the revised Statutes.

IR of Iran asked whether it was necessary to have a drafting group (DG) to work on the text and raised the matter that according to Article 6b the elected Chairman should host the meeting in the same country.

Pakistan considered that there should be a possibility of a country hosting a meeting without necessarily holding the chairmanship.

Saudi Arabia also considered that this should be left open and reported that a recent meeting of the NIOHC, chaired by UKHO, was hosted by Saudi Arabia and this had worked well. All MS in the Region must be active participants.

UAE considered that the Chairmanship should change every 2 years.

ROPME agreed that the Statutes needed amendment and suggested that the Chairman should take the lead and go through the Statutes step by step in plenary. He also considered that the Chairmanship should be rotational.

Kuwait asked whether signature of the Statutes by the MS was necessary and suggested working on this by correspondence and then allowing 2 or 3 months for States to approve the text.

Pakistan considered that the changes being considered could be approved within the Commission.

Saudi Arabia agreed that the revisions being considered were within the competence of the Commission to decide.

UAE reported that they had not received any documentation or seen any correspondence since the last meeting. The secretary reported that all the necessary documents concerning this meeting have been available on the IHO web site and distributed by email. The UAE replied that they had only received the papers the day before and that they were unaware of their availability on the IHO web site.

ROPME stated that the papers had been sent out at least 2 months previously by fax and email and communication had been maintained during this period. ROPME considered that the changes being proposed were not substantive and that they were well within the competence of the RSAHC as a technical body.

It was agreed that the Commission was competent to review the Statutes and therefore a DG was established, under the chairmanship of Pakistan, to prepare a revised text.

This topic was resumed on day two when the work of the DG was presented. The principle changes are:

- Article 4 change meetings to “annually”.
- Article 5 to allow for chairing etc by a Vice Chairman.
- Article 6 Chairman and meeting preferably to be in the same country.
- Chairman and Vice-chairman to take office on election.

Kuwait proposed that the text of article 4 should remain i.e. to meet at least twice between successive ordinary IHCs. UAE and OMAN agreed with Kuwait. The IHB suggested that the text might be amended to read “at least biennially” as this would give the flexibility to hold meetings more often if necessary.

It was noted that following the introduction of a Vice Chairman there were several further editorial amendments required to incorporate this concept fully into the Statutes. Some further editorial changes, to improve the text, were suggested and agreed. The revised RSAHC Statutes are at Annex 8.

### **Agenda Item 6: IHB Report**

The IHB in its report emphasised the important role that RHCs had to play in facilitating cooperation between MS within the Region and in enabling the IHO to meet its objectives. Of the 9 States in the Region, all were members of IMO, 8 were members of IOC, 5 were members of IALA and 6 were members of the IHO with the membership of a further two, Qatar and Saudi Arabia, having been approved by IHO MS. Both Qatar and Saudi Arabia indicated their hopes of depositing their instruments of accession in the near future. Despite this potential for regional cooperation it was disappointing to note that only 1 MS in the Region regularly participated in the activities of the various IHO Committees and Working Groups. The amendments to the IHO Convention which had been agreed at the 3<sup>rd</sup> EIHC in 2005 placed even greater importance on the Regional Commissions given their permanent membership on the Council.

The IHB then summarised its activities under the 5 Work Programme Elements:

- Programme 1. Cooperation between Member States and with International Organizations.
- Programme 2. Capacity Building.
- Programme 3. Techniques and Standards Support.
- Programme 4. Information Management and Public Relations.
- Programme 5. General Development of the Organization.

Finally the IHB outlined the events taking place in preparation for the XVII<sup>th</sup> IHC in May 2007 and emphasised the need for MS and the RHC to maintain awareness of the developments. All relevant documents were being made available on the IHO web site.

Kuwait asked about the status of compulsory carriage requirement for ECDIS within IMO? IHB reported that the IMO NAV sub-committee had approved the compulsory carriage requirement for High Speed Craft but that this was yet to be approved by the MSC. Compulsory carriage requirement for other craft was not yet on the Work Programme of IMO but it was expected that this would be added to the work programme in the near future. The IHB explained that the 25% coverage for GMDSS related to 25% of countries not 25% of area. Following a question regarding the survey of difficult areas in the northern Persian Gulf the IHB replied that it could not undertake surveys, only assist in the coordination.

#### **Agenda Item 7: National reports.**

Each State present at the meeting gave a short report on their national reports which can be found at Annexes 9 to 17. Although not able to attend the meeting the UK provided a national report which is included.

The IHB commented that the reports had highlighted the large range of disparate organizations within the States of the Region that were involved in “hydrography”. This once again highlighted the importance of cooperation both within States and between States in order to improve Safety of Navigation and Protection of the Marine Environment within the Region. All Member States should make use of the IHB to help improve this cooperation. To this end communication was vital and it was very important that the detailed coordinates of all those attending this meeting were recorded and noted. (See Annex 20)

#### **Agenda Item 8: Training and Education.**

The Chairman stated that he believed that it would be good to have a regional training facility and asked those attending for their views on this matter.

Bahrain asked whether the courses run at the Iranian universities were in Farsi or in English. It was stated that these were in Farsi but they could be in English and it was considered that this could be of great interest to all the regional States.

Kuwait stated that they would like to see courses that were recognised by the IHO.

Pakistan considered that they could offer both basic and advanced courses but that these were not currently recognised by IHO.

Oman considered training to be an important regional issue and asked whether it might be possible to establish a regional Academy along the lines of the International Maritime Academy (IMA) in Trieste Italy.

The IHB reported that IMA was currently facing funding difficulties. RSAHC might wish to consider setting up a regional centre. A regional proposal to the IHO CBF could be made seeking support to hold a meeting to investigate the setting up of such an academy.

UAE stated that they were considering the establishment of a maritime academy in conjunction with an Australian partner. It might be possible to hold discussions with them regarding the provision of some hydrographic training courses.

Saudi Arabia considered that a regional academy was a good idea but only if all the regional States supported it with money, students and ships. The IHO recognition of any courses offered was vital.

Bahrain asked why the IHO could not set up an International Academy in the Region. UAE and Oman both stated that it was important not to open two academies in the Region.

ROPME stated that the first task must be to establish what the needs of the Region were and what the existing capacity was. Only then could plans be made as to how to best meet the requirements of the Region.

IR of Iran said that they could provide both short and longer courses on ENC's, and would like these to meet IHO standards. They could also arrange some short applied courses and would be delighted for the IR of Iran to be the focal point for training in the Region.

Oman considered there to be a greater need for longer career forming courses.

Kuwait considered that there was a need to do a study into what is currently available and what is needed.

Bahrain commented that IHO Cat A/B recognition of courses was not recognised by civilian authorities whereas civilian qualifications e.g. Diploma, BSc, MSc were. Civilian surveyors did not tend to meet requirements such as Bridge Watchkeeping Certificates / Experience which was important within military circles.

The IHB agreed that it was difficult to set an International level because of the variation from country to country. The IHB recommends that each institution, running IHO Cat A/B courses, liaise with academia in its country in order to obtain academic recognition for the courses alongside the IHO Cat A/B. Several Cat A courses provided by military training schools also had a PG Diploma or MSc recognition from a local university. Short courses, whilst a different matter, were also vital. Section 4 of S-55 provides the facility to analyse the availability and needs.

ROPME emphasised the need for all States to fully complete the S-55 questionnaire and submit it to the IHB in order for the needs of the Region to be correctly analysed.

**Action Item 1: All States to provide training information i.e. what they can offer and what they need to the chairman by 31 December 2006. The next meeting would then be able to make some decisions based on this information.**

**Agenda Item 9: S-55**

The IHB outlined the status of the 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition of S-55 and highlighted the high profile that this database now had within the UN and IMO to which organizations the IHB provided regular reports.

Kuwait requested assistance in completing S-55. The IHB replied that both the IHB and Captain Barritt of the UKHO, who was acting as the S-55 coordinator on behalf of the IHB, were always available to provide any assistance required. The IHB also mentioned a paper prepared by Colombia on how they had determined the figures to be included in S-55. This will be made available on the IHB web site.

ROPME enquired as to the process for obtaining assistance. The IHB replied that both the IHB and Captain Barritt could be approached directly with any request for assistance in completing the form. (hgorziglia@ihb.mc sshipman@ihb.mc mike.barritt@ukho.gov.uk).

Oman commented that if you follow the paper from IHO and talk to Captain Barritt it was not difficult to complete the S-55 questionnaire.

The Commission requested the IHB to pass on its thanks to Captain Barritt for his assistance with S-55.

**Action Item 2: All States are urged to send in the information required by S-55 to the IHB and to provide regular updates as the data changes. Continuing action.**

**Action Item 3: IHB to place the Colombian paper on the IHO web site by 31 July 2006.**

**Agenda Item 10: Capacity Building**

The IHB reported on the establishment of the Capacity Building Committee (CBC) including its TOR, the associated Capacity Building Fund (CBF) and the determination of a definition of "Capacity Building" from an IHO perspective.

As the RSAHC have not been represented at the recent meetings of the CBC the IHB had made an estimate of what the Region's needs might be and included these in the WP of the CBC. The next meeting of the CBC is in Maputo, Mozambique in June and it is vital that this meeting of the RSAHC provide the IHB with an indication of its priorities for CBC, ideally by the end of the meeting and certainly no later than the end of May. The IHB is also preparing the IHO WP for the period 2008 - 2012 which will be considered at the XVIIth IHC in May 2007 and it is important that the input from the RSAHC is received by the 1<sup>st</sup> August as has been requested in a letter sent to all RHC Chairmen.

Oman suggested that maybe there was a need to think about this for a week or two and then reply by correspondence.

Qatar asked whether the CBC could help in providing Hydrographic equipment or even a hydrographic vessel. The IHB replied that the CBC was able to provide for: technical visits; improve training capacity; fund attendance at meetings, courses, seminars, workshops and possibly to provide seed money for projects. It could not provide funds to establish an HO or to buy equipment.

Kuwait enquired about technical visits by the IHO and asked how the details would be discussed and how the visit would be handled. The IHB explained the process followed for the WAAT in West Africa.

UAE raised the matter of “Geospatial Data Infrastructure” (GDI) and asked how the IHO could help the UAE. The IHB reported on the meeting recently held in Rostock Germany. This had been a starting point to recognise that GDI was important subject that hydrographic offices needed to keep abreast of. Information regarding further meetings and their results would continue to be circulated by Circular Letter and displayed on the IHO web site. It was important that all MS visited the IHO web site regularly as this was now a key means of disseminating important information for all MS.

An ad hoc group was established to assimilate the Capacity Building requirements for the Region and to agree on the priorities to be considered by the Maputo meeting. The resulting table was agreed on Day 2 and is at Annex 18.

**Action Item 4: RSAHC States to consider the longer term requirements for the period 2008 – 2012 and pass this information to the Chairman as soon as possible.**

**Action Item 5: Chairman to co-ordinate these requirements and forward them to the IHB by the 1<sup>st</sup> September 2006 at the latest and preferably by the 1<sup>st</sup> August 2006.**

#### **Agenda Item 11: WVNWS - Navarea IX Report**

Pakistan as the NAVAREA IX Co-ordinator reported on activities within the Navarea and the facilities available for promulgating MSI. He highlighted those States within the Region with whom Pakistan had little or no communication regarding MSI.

Saudi Arabia requested information as to who the contact points for MSI were in each State. Pakistan replied that although they had several contacts in various States some did not reply to requests for MSI.

Kuwait commented that they sent all their MSI information to MENAS.

**Action Item 6: All States to provide points of contact for MSI to the Coordinator (Pakistan) by 1 September 2006.**

**Action Item 7: Navarea IX coordinator to provide the updated list to all States by 1 October 2006.**

#### **Agenda Item 12: Report by the INT Chart Co-ordinator**

The IR of Iran as the INT Chart Co-ordinator gave a brief oral report; the full text is at Annex 19. There are 106 INT charts in Region I.

The IHB provided a draft copy of the Region I section of M-11 which it had compiled based on information received from several States. The IHB requested the MS to



review this document, make any corrections necessary and for the Co-ordinator to forward the final accepted document to the IHB for inclusion in M-11.

Kuwait raised the matter of 1 chart of Kuwaiti waters which had been produced by UK without the agreement of Kuwait. There had been a lack of communication / consultation on this matter and it was important that discussion took place and agreement reached before any such charts were published.

Saudi Arabia agreed that a producer must consult with the country concerned. The UK are producing and selling without the proper consultation with the country concerned.

The IHB reported that it maintains M-11 based on the information provided by RHCs. The INT Chart Co-ordinator should discuss matters within the Region and then pass the result to IHB for inclusion in M-11.

Pakistan reported that they had produced 2 new INT Charts.

**Action Item 8: All States to review the draft M-11 and pass comments to the INT Chart co-ordinator (IR of Iran) by 31 August 2006.**

**Action Item 9: IR of Iran as INT Chart Region I Co-ordinator to forward final text to IHB for inclusion in M-11 by 30 September 2006.**

### **Agenda Item 13: ENC issues**

IR of Iran considered that it would be good to have a single distributor for the Region's ENCs as it believes that this would simplify matters and speed up the availability of ENCs to the mariner.

Oman suggested that it might be difficult to have a RENC for the Region as Oman is currently committed to the IC-ENC RENC until such time as Oman handles its own ENCs.

Kuwait stated that it was difficult for them to discuss ENC coverage at this time. They would need several months for their ENC plans to be formalised before they could report to the chairman and the IHO. Kuwait expected to finalize the number of its ENCs by early 2007.

Qatar suggested that using the WWW and Internet it would be easy for States to distribute ENCs themselves rather than using a major distributor such as IC-ENC. They considered that if they provided the data then they had both rights and responsibilities, however if they did not provide the data then responsibility lay solely with the producer.

IR of Iran reported that they had produced 10 ENC covering 800 Sq Km up to their territorial waters.

Pakistan reported that the UKHO would produce ENCs on their behalf and that these would be distributed through IC-ENC.

Bahrain considered that the production of ENCs and their subsequent distribution were two distinct issues. They had chosen to work with IC-ENC but would be doing all the ENC validation themselves.

Qatar reported that they had a bi-lateral agreement with the UKHO.

UAE reported that the UKHO would produce ENCs on their behalf.

Saudi Arabia reported that they were having some difficulties with UKHO regarding copyright.

**Action Item 10: All States to consider the possibilities of using a single distributor for the RSAHC and to pass their thoughts to the Chairman by 31 December 2006. The feedback would then be discussed at the next meeting.**

**Agenda Item 14: New Techniques and equipment in Hydrography and Oceanography**

UAE reported on some satellite altimetry work being carried out by a UAE university and its use to determine Geoid height.

IHB raised the possibility of States preparing papers for publication in the International Hydrographic Review. This was produced by GITC on behalf of the IHO and was an excellent means of States informing others of the important developments taking place within their Region.

**Action Item 11: Member States to provide information on relevant topics for discussion at the next meeting. Member States should also consider sending relevant papers to Captain Gorziglia who would forward them to the Editor of the IHR for consideration for publication. Action continuous.**

**Agenda Item 15, Coordination between Member States**

This topic had occurred on several occasions during discussion of the other agenda items. Coordination between MS was a vital role of the RHC. An important element of coordination is communication, it is therefore important that MS within the Region maintain close contact in the periods between meetings of the RSAHC. See Annex 20 for the contact details of those participating in the meeting.

**Agenda Item 16: Any other business**

IHB gave a brief update on SPWG activities. IR of Iran reported on the active participation by Mr. Ghaderi, the former chairman of the RSAHC, in 4 SPWG meetings during years 2001 and 2003 where he contributed widely to the development of the amendments to the IHO Convention, particularly with regard to the membership of the Council.

**Action Item 12: All States and the RSAHC to contribute and participate in the work of the SPWG and the IHC. Action continuous.**

**Agenda Item 17 and 18: Next meeting, venue and date, and Election of Chairman and Vice-chairman**

Saudi Arabia proposed Pakistan to be Chairman of the RSAHC and this was carried unanimously. The meeting subsequently elected Saudi Arabia as Vice-Chairman. The meeting agreed that its next meeting should be held in Pakistan.

### **Agenda Item 19: Closing Remarks by the Chairman**

The Chairman reviewed the action Items from the meeting and these together with completion dates are in Annex 21.

The Chairman thanked all the participants for attending and contributing to what he hoped was a very successful meeting. He wished Pakistan well as they assumed the role of Chairman of the RSAHC.

\*\*\*\*\*

### **LIST OF ANNEXES TO THIS REPORT**

- Annex 1.** Opening speech by the Chairman of the RSAHC.
- Annex 2.** Speech by H.E. the Minister of Roads and Transportation
- Annex 3.** Speech by the Director of the IHB
- Annex 4.** Speech by the ROPME Coordinator
- Annex 5.** Provisional Agenda
- Annex 6.** Time Table
- Annex 7.** Review of Action Items from Previous Meeting
- Annex 8.** Revised RSAHC Statutes
- Annex 9.** National Report from Bahrain
- Annex 10.** National Report from the I.R. Iran
- Annex 11.** National Report from Kuwait
- Annex 12.** National Report from Sultanate of Oman
- Annex 13.** National Report from Pakistan
- Annex 14.** National Report from Qatar
- Annex 15.** National Report from the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia
- Annex 16.** National Report from the United Arab Emirates – Not yet available.
- Annex 17.** National Report from the United Kingdom
- Annex 18.** Short Term Priorities for Capacity Building in RSAHC
- Annex 19.** Report on Area “I” INT Charts by I.R. Iran
- Annex 20.** List of Participants
- Annex 21.** List of Action item