

16th Meeting of the MesoAmerican-Caribbean Sea Hydrographic Commission
Antigua, 9-12 December 2015

Paper for Consideration

Consideration of an independent MACHC Risk Assessment Group

<i>Submitted by:</i>	MACHC Integrated Charting Committee
<i>Executive Summary:</i>	<p>As documented in its 2015 Work Plan, the MACHC Integrated Charting Committee has examined several Risk Assessment methodologies this past year. While the MICC agrees that this may be a useful tool, it became clear that this is a rather significant undertaking, in terms resource requirements and is beyond the scope of the MICC.</p> <p>Therefore the MICC proposes to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ask the MACHC whether a Risk Assessment project in the MACHC Region can be supported, and if so; 2. Request MACHC to establish a separate independent "Risk Assessment Group" on a temporary basis.
<i>Related Documents:</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MICC Report to MACHC Plenary (December 2015) • Article 3. b), 6 of the MACHC Statutes (on Working Groups)
<i>Related Projects:</i>	Annex A-Proposed Terms of Reference for an independent Working Group for future MACHC Risk Assessment activity.
<i>Enclosure:</i>	

Introduction / Background / Analysis / Discussion

Risk Assessment Methodology had been a subject of discussion at the 2013 and 2014 MACHC Conference. Since its introduction, the MICC examined two models: the IALA model; and the more sophisticated New Zealand (Vanuatu) model. The IALA effort utilized IWRAP (modeling tool useful for maritime risk assessment) information. The findings of both the IALA and the New Zealand projects appeared very conspicuous, but require further, more detailed analysis. Eventually, it was determined evaluate the IALA Risk Model because it was more localized in high traffic areas. The MICC performed such an analysis in some of the MACHC area "choke" points. The New Zealand Model, however, is more sophisticated and would conceivably yield improved results. The challenging issue with this model is that it involves many more resources which preclude further exploration at this time.

A sub-group of MICC participants communicated throughout the year, with very limited progress. During deliberations, the group decided that perhaps this activity could be handled by the MEIP or a separate MACHC Working Group. But because this is a rather significant undertaking, the MICC determined that any further activities on Risk Assessment is more appropriately handled directly under the MACHC by a separate Working Group specifically tasked with this activity. It was further determined that Risk Assessment is primarily geared toward the regions and that a separate group (or team) established under the MACHC to address this activity is the more logical approach. In order to move forward with this approach, the MICC proposes that the MACHC establish a separate group (or team). Proposed Draft Terms of Reference for a separate Working Group is provided as ANNEX A, below.

Recommendations

1. MACHC Members discuss and consider future plans for any further Risk Assessment activities.

Action required of ARHC

2. The MACHC is invited to decide whether to:
 - a. Abandon further Risk Assessments Projects at this time; or
 - b. Proceed and establish a separate independent Working Group on Risk Assessment.