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ENG14 report to PAP44

# Overview

The 14th meeting of the ENG Committee (ENG14) was held virtually from 4 October to 2 November 2021. The session was attended by 114 registered participants from 30 countries. 13 participants attended for the first time.

Working in four working groups, the Committee considered 66 input and produced 8 output documents.

As with other committees, the virtual meeting system worked well and the work plan was progressed.

Key work areas of specific interest to PAP:

* Enhanced Radar Positioning Service workshop held in November 2021, this was a success with interest from all stakeholders.
* AtoN Engineering Workshop in Sydney postponed until further notice
* Proposed to start the formal procedures to arrange a virtual Heritage Seminar in August 2022 hosted by Directorate of Hydrography and Navigation, Brazil.
* 2023 – 2027 work plan drafted.

## Presentations

Presentations were given on the following topics:

* Use of Drones
* SBAS Standardisation
* ERPS
* World Wide Academy
* Workers & Light Keepers training courses

## Heritage

Some discussion on the future of the Lighthouse of the Year (see annex below) and the Chair would appreciate the view from PAP for the future direction of the Heritage Lighthouse of the Year as to whether it wishes to see IALA HLY develop into an annual competition with a systematically selected winner or for it to continue as an informally commended accolade.

## ENG15

Generally, ENG is on track with the work plan and working effectively with the virtual arrangements but looks forward to returning in person as soon as possible

# Action requested PAP44

1. PAP is invited to consider the liaison note to PAP (PAP44 6.1.6.10) on ideas for Sustainability in the management of AtoN and respond to ENG as appropriate.
2. Note the Liaison note to MASS TG (ENG14.12.0.1) on the work in ENG relating to MASS
3. Consider the future direction of the Heritage Lighthouse of the Year proposal and advise ENG accordingly.

Extract from the ENG14 final report :

*12.3.4 IALA Heritage Lighthouse of the Year (IALA HLY) 2023 and beyond (Task 2.6.4) WG4 were pleased to receive a presentation from Guo Zhenyu from China MSA on ENG14 Input Paper 3.1.4.2 Modification proposal for improving the selection mechanism of IALA Heritage Lighthouse of the Year from China MSA. The paper and presentation centred around proposals for a more competitive version of IALA HLY than currently exists. Report of the 14th Session of the IALA AtoN Engineering and Sustainability (ENG) Committee Page 29 of 47 The subsequent discussion revealed two very different visions for the future of the accolade were held by participants of WG4. These visions are summarised as follows;*

*1. Continuing as an informally commended accolade Each year, ENG WG4 form a Judging Panel that selects, by consensus which nominated lighthouse it wishes ENG Committee to commend to Council as IALA HLY together with its reasons. The decision is then made by IALA Council. The judging panel consider the cultural, historic and conservation aspects of each nominated lighthouse but also other factors which may cause a particular lighthouse to be a good choice in a particular year for raising the profile of lighthouse heritage and culture. There is no ‘winner’ and no sense that the accolade holder is ‘the best’ in any way. However, recognition is given to the particular qualities of the lighthouse and there is an opportunity to celebrate this. An award has been presented each year to mark the accolade.*

*2. Developing IALA HLY into an annual competition with a systematically selected winner IALA HLY could instead be developed into a competition with an annual winner. That annual winner would be the lighthouse that the judges on a judging panel scored highest using detailed criteria and scoring mechanisms. Judges would receive training and have a degree of expertise in lighthouse heritage. There would be strict criteria to ensure transparency and objectivity. Nominees would be expected to show commitment to the award – perhaps presenting to the judging panel and fielding questions from it.*

*It was considered premature to consider the detailed proposals outlined in the Input Paper for implementing the second of those visions before first resolving in which of the two future directions the accolade was to go. After considerable discussion, it did not prove possible for a consensus to be reached within WG4 on two such contrasting visions. WG4 therefore seek the input and direction of ENG Committee as to which of these two general directions it wishes IALA LHY to go. Regardless of the outcome, WG4 consider the discussion to be timely and positive – not least so there can be greater ongoing consensus and understanding of the nature of the accolade across IALA.*

*Action Items The Committee participants are requested to provide direction to WG4 as to whether it wishes to see IALA HLY develop into an annual competition with a systematically selected winner or for it to continue as an informally commended accolade.*

1. Input document number, to be assigned by the Committee Secretary [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Leave open if uncertain [↑](#footnote-ref-2)