



MACHC MEIP Maritime Environment Infrastructure Programme Letter to Members November 2016

28 November 2016

Dear MACHC Member

Following on from my Letter 21 October 2016, I would now like to encourage you to come to MACHC 17 prepared to discuss the MEIP Think Piece issues.

You will recall that MACHC 16 agreed the following actions for the MEIPWG:

1. MEIP Chair to prepare a 'think piece' which lists potential options for the way ahead for the MEIP with the aim to facilitate decision making in the next MACHC. The ambition level is central to this piece: how and with what data to integrate and fit in with other complementary initiatives for spatial data infrastructures, an example being the "Eye on the Earth" project of PAIGH. Essentially this is to set out the purpose and direction of the MEIP.
2. Member states are invited to share their thoughts on the future of the MEIP via correspondence/e-mail before next MACHC.

I have listed some of our discussion points and options with recommendations for the way forward below and invite you to consider some of these and come prepared to share your opinions.

THINK PIECE Discussion points

1. Does the viewer help identify gaps? – *To a degree, but it only really identifies gaps in ENC coverage and this can be done by other methods*
2. Is ENC data alone enough? – *It is not ideal but it's a start and we should not underestimate the progress and contributions MS have made to date.*
3. Will MS share other data? – *Unknown, but in the short term we feel it is unlikely*
4. What other data should we look to include? – *There are many sites that could be linked to the viewer via WMS services, so do we need to include other data which may also require maintaining*
5. Do we want to duplicate other information – *No this would be pointless but we want to be able to access as much useful data as possible*
6. Does WMS facility allow users to access any other data they need? – *Yes depending on what it is. We have joined with GEOSUR to access their land data. This can be extended as required but access to data from GEBCO should be explored*
7. Is the MEIP still required given other initiatives? – *Yes it is useful to have a site that is specifically for MACHC region only so that MS can decide on what is included and can work together to meet MACHC requirements*

8. Can we go any further without funding / additional resource? – *We have benefit greatly from NOAA’s contribution. We have no other resource available so it will be difficult to make any significant advances. Maybe the MACHC Chair and IHB Directing team could be instructed to actively seek alternate funding for MACHC regional projects to encourage the capture of up to date information and the management of the MEIP system*
9. Would Technical visit reports (IHB / OECS) be of use? – *Absolutely yes. These documents in general terms highlight areas of improvement and requirements for each nation. The IHB Technical visit reports are available on the IHO website but how often are they used*
10. Can the work of the MEIP and MICC be combined? – *The lack of volunteers to become Chair of either MICC or MEIP and the fact that the viewer is based on ENC data suggests that there is the possibility that this should be considered*
11. *How useful was the MEIP in the aftermath of Hurricane Matthew?*

The ambition level is central to the piece. This could lead in to two scoping questions:

- Do we see MACHC providing also a GIS or only providing Data?
- Do we see MACHC only providing ‘its own’ authoritative source data, or also as a ‘broker’ of data?

Looking at how and with what data to integrate could be defined on 2 axis e.g. resulting in the table below indicating WHAT is available. The X’s depict an option. (1) For sale- through licensing.

How\Data	Bathymetric	S-57	Other HO data sets
Discover	X	X	X
View	X	X	
Download	X	(1)	

Next would be WHERE it is made available (e.g. CMA 2 or Eye on Earth). This could possibly require active marketing, but more resource.

OPTIONS

- a. No resource available to make big steps, so opportunities for funding must be explored to go much further
- b. Stop all work on MEIP (continue or not?)
- c. Continue with both viewers
- d. Only retain the open viewer
- e. Include Technical reports as they have use in identifying gaps
- f. WMS facility allows users to bring in whatever data they like to overlay on the ENCS
- g. Will MS be willing to include more data?
- h. Can the MEIP and the viewer be passed to others to run and manage (IC-ENC / IHB?)
- i. Can the MEIP and MICC WG be combined (gap work is related to both)

MEIP WG Recommendations

1. Continue to populate the viewer but only retain the open viewer
2. Include all available Technical reports
3. Combine MICC / MEIP WG
4. Instruct MACHC Chair and IHB Directors to actively seek funding for regional activity that generates data capture and encourage data sharing.

I look forward to discussing these issues with you

Best wishes

Chris Thorne

MEIP Chair