



IHB File No S3/3055

CIRCULAR LETTER 42/2008
29 April 2008

IHO SUBMISSIONS ON ENCs TO IMO SUB-COMMITTEE ON SAFETY OF NAVIGATION

Reference: CL 33/2008 dated 02 April - Draft IHO Submissions on ENCs to IMO Sub-Committee on Safety of Navigation

Dear Hydrographer,

1 The IHB would like to thank the following 19 Member States who replied to the reference: Australia, Canada, Cuba, Finland, France, Greece, Italy, Japan, Monaco, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Portugal, Singapore, South Africa, Turkey, and the UK. Seven Member States provided comments on the draft texts and these are at Annex A.

2 The IHB has also prepared and submitted an Information Document reporting on updated IHO publications of relevance to IMO. The texts of the 3 submitted papers are available from the IHO web site: www.iho.org > Int Organizations > IMO.

3 Member States are kindly requested to inform their Administrations attending NAV54 of the position adopted by the IHO and to request their support for the IHO position. The Directing Committee would appreciate advance notice if it is anticipated that any Administrations are likely to take a contrary position.

4 The IHB is arranging for a seminar which will include presentations, the display of posters and a question and answer session to be held at the IMO Headquarters following the close of business on the first day of NAV54.

On behalf of the Directing Committee
Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to be 'A. Maratos', written over a horizontal line.

Vice Admiral Alexandros MARATOS
President

Annex A: Comments by Member States

Australia:

In response to IHB Circular letter 33/2008 the Australian Hydrographic Service has consulted with the Australian Maritime Safety Authority and offers the following comments:

The wording of the first sentence of paragraph (6) of the draft of "DEVELOPMENT OF CARRIAGE REQUIREMENTS FOR ECDIS" could infer that the Appropriate Portfolio of up to date paper Charts (APC) is one and the same thing as the paper charts to be carried as a backup to ECDIS where only one ECDIS is fitted. These are not necessarily supposed to be one and the same thing, but they could be if so decided by the coastal State. See the ECDIS performance standard (RESOLUTION MSC.232(82), adopted on 5 December 2006). The relevant sections are 14, appendix 6 and appendix 7 section 3.7.

The suggested text for para (6) is as follows:

6 The catalogue, as requested by the Sub-Committee, will also provide information regarding coastal States' recommendations for:

- a. the appropriate portfolio of up-to-date paper charts to be used as a backup in areas where ECDIS is operated in RCDS mode, and/or
- b. the possibly differing requirement for paper charts to be used as backup when a single ECDIS with ENCs is in use.

The Sub-Committee has requested coastal States to forward this information to the IHO for inclusion in the catalogue and this request has been endorsed by the Maritime Safety Committee. IHO and IMO Member States were requested by IHO and IMO Circular Letters respectively in both 2007 and 2008 to provide this information. Despite these requests, at the time of submission, the IHO had only received information from 33 coastal States.

With regard to paragraph (8), Australia considers that the most effective solution for mariners remains a single central catalogue to show coastal States' recommendations for the APC. This remains the preferred solution despite the technical difficulty experienced with collating data from individual member states whilst attempting to establish the central catalogue. A further call to IHO Member States to provide data in an IHO provided template may ease this difficulty. It is therefore suggested that text of paragraph (8) be amended to reflect an intention to provide a single central reference for mariners, but note that this will be unlikely to be fully populated by June 2008.

With regard to paragraph (11), Australia considers that this should also reflect the intention to provide a single central reference, again based upon this being of greater benefit to mariners in the longer term than the need to refer to information from separate member states. However if the IHB's intention remains to query the ongoing requirement for the central catalogue, and the IMO agrees to this request, then it should be noted that the ECDIS performance standard would need to be revised. This is because the MSC Resolution 232(82) (appendix 7, section 3.7) currently makes specific mention of the IHO's worldwide chart database containing details of the APC.

Comments by IHB: The proposals by Australia have been incorporated. In particular the request to NAV54 to re-consider the requirement for the "paper chart" information has been removed and the IHB will seek to increase the availability and uniformity of the information provided.

Canada:

Canada agrees with the spirit and text of the NAV54 submission 'Evaluation of Electronic Navigational Chart Availability'.

Canada suggests slight adjustment of the tone of the NAV54 submission 'Development of a comprehensive online catalogue of available official charts'. Given the broad audience at NAV54, Canada suggests that it would be sufficient to indicate that 'it has been more difficult than anticipated to develop a comprehensive worldwide catalogue and that alternate solutions are.....'

Description of the variety of Member's submissions may not be needed and this approach would avoid embarrassing any particular State(s).

Comment by the IHB: The wording has been modified to reflect the concern expressed by Canada.

France:

In the CL in reference b), the IHB DC invites Member States to comment on two draft submissions to the 54th Session of the IMO Sub-Committee on Safety of Navigation (NAV54).

With regard to the draft submission concerning ENC availability (*disponibilité*¹), France supports the proposed submission prepared in consultation with the WEND Task Group. Some remarks and suggestions are nevertheless proposed and explained in Annex I.

As regards the proposed submission concerning the development of a comprehensive online chart catalogue, France considers that, as it stands, it discredits the IHO as a whole, and that it is both imprecise and counter-productive compared to the first submission, taking into account the mandate fixed by IMO, and the objective targeted in the preparation of the NAV54 sub-committee to take all the necessary measures to encourage the carriage of ECDIS (which implicitly includes the question of appropriate paper chart portfolios). France evidently understands how difficult it is to dispose of exhaustive information enabling the production of an operational and easy to use catalogue, but considers that the justifications contained in the draft submission, on the one hand, and the recommendation to the sub-committee to reconsider its request on the other, are inappropriate. Some remarks and suggestions concerning the submission related to the catalogue are given in Annex II.

Finally, France notes that a special meeting (X WEND) was held in October 2007 precisely to prepare the NAV 54 SC session. It would be very useful if the IHB could forward as soon as possible to the Member States the status of the actions decided at that meeting (ref. a) so that MS can keep their delegations at NAV S-C updated on the matter.

ANNEX I

Proposed corrections to the submission: "Evaluation of ENC Availability"

Most of the suggestions made by France within the WEND Task Group have been taken into account. There remains three points upon which France believes it useful to insist:

§ 2: France considers that it is inappropriate, and probably counter-productive, to maintain the second bullet on supporting IMO efforts to introduce mandatory carriage requirements for ECDIS and on the impact of such an obligation on the production of ENCs. France would very much like this reference to be deleted.

§ 9: France considers that reference to updating is particularly important, bearing in mind the responsibility of hydrographic services in this area (compared to private publishers²) and proposes that the text be modified, as below:

Instead of:

The IHO and its Member State HOs in addition to their efforts to complete worldwide coverage of ENCs are fully committed to continuously improve the consistency and quality of ENCs. Work on these issues is continuing and IHO Member States are acting to ensure that matters concerning safety of navigation and protection of the marine environment are being fully dealt with.

It should read:

The IHO and its Member State HOs in addition to their efforts to complete worldwide coverage of ENCs are fully committed to continuously improve the consistency and quality of ENCs. Work on these issues, **which encompasses the provision of timely updates**, is continuing and IHO Member States are acting to ensure that matters concerning safety of navigation and protection of the marine environment are being fully dealt with.

¹ The term "*disponibilité*" is preferred to the words « *mise à disposition* » used in para. 2 of the CL in ref. b

² SOLAS, Chapter V, Rule 27

And finally it seems that the double negative in the second sentence of § 11 might cause confusion, all the more so that it is somewhat redundant in view of the last sentence of this paragraph. Therefore, in § 11, instead of:

ENC production, consistency and availability is constantly increasing and will continue to do so. There is no reason to doubt that there will be an adequate worldwide coverage of consistent ENCs by 2010. Factual figures and HO official planning reports show that the world's major trading routes and ports will be covered by 2010.

It should read:

ENC production, consistency and availability is constantly increasing and will continue to do so. ~~There is no reason to doubt that there will be an adequate worldwide coverage of consistent ENCs by 2010.~~ Factual figures and HO official planning reports show that the world's major trading routes and ports will be covered by 2010.

ANNEX II

Remarks and suggestions on the submission:

"Development of a comprehensive online catalogue of available official charts"

1. In the "Executive Summary", it is not correct to say that: "This document provides updated information on the development of the IHO online catalogue of ENCs, RNCs and coastal States recommendations for the appropriate portfolio of paper charts **to be carried as backup**".

Even if certain Member States do not make any distinction, we know for a fact that this catalogue fulfils two distinct functions:

- One concerns the operation of ECDIS in RCDS mode which obliges the mariner to have onboard an appropriate portfolio of up-to-date paper charts (APC) which may be easily consulted by the mariner³; it is not in this case a back-up;
- the other which effectively concerns the back-up for ECDIS (when a single ECDIS with ENCs is in use).

2. For the same reason, the first sentence of § 6 is incorrect.

3. In § 5, the first sentence relates to an IHO internal arrangement which is not relevant to IMO in the present context: "Similar harvesting tools for RNC coverage have been developed **and made available** to those hydrographic offices producing RNCs".

4. § 7 is very technical and of very little interest to IMO.

5. § 8 questions an IMO mandate, by presenting technical explanations which are particular to the IHO. It largely casts a doubt as regards IHO's capability to assume its role in terms of coordination of matters linked to charting in general, and to electronic charting in particular. This is an admission of failure.

France therefore recommends that a simple and concise report be submitted to the NAV54 Sub-Committee on the progress made with the online catalogue, because the development of this catalogue is required, on the one hand, and because it is part of the mandatory requirements concerning the carriage of ECDIS, on the other. France suggests that the sub-committee should be

³ MSC 232(82) Resolution, MSC 82/24/Add.2, Appendix 7, § 1.2, Adoption of the Revised Performance Standards for Electronic Chart Display and Information Systems (ECDIS), 5 Dec 2006.

informed of the difficulties encountered and the recommended measures to remedy them, for example:

- IHB contacts, bilateral or through the regional hydrographic commissions, with the Member States who have not been able to provide their input;
- studies of alternative structures to a single catalogue;
- spreading the work out over a period of time and beginning by navigation basins for which information is available, in order to demonstrate the feasibility and to consolidate the specifications of the information related to those zones which are not yet covered;
- undertaking a standardization target process of the rules adopted by Coastal States and the Flag States⁴.

Comments by the IHB: With respect to the "ENC Availability" document the second bullet point to paragraph 2 of the paper has been retained. This was a resolution of the XVIIth IHC and IMO/NAV has been informed of it previously. The texts of paragraphs 9 and 11 (now 10 and 12) have been amended as suggested. With regard to the "Catalogue" document the Executive summary and paragraph 6 have been amended. Paragraph 5 has also been amended as suggested and paragraph 7 simplified. The request to the Sub-Committee to review the requirement to present coastal States' recommendations regarding "paper chart requirements back up for a single ECDIS and as supplement when using ECDIS in the RCDS mode" has been removed as also suggested by Australia.

Monaco:

Monaco is pleased to inform you that ENCs for Monaco are provided by SHOM (France) and that the comments made by France are supported by Monaco.

New Zealand:

The draft submissions are excellent. We have considered the Canada response and agree with the slight adjustment in tone of the NAV54 submission 'Development of a comprehensive online chart catalogue of available official charts'. You may like to consider the following changes;

Para 6, line 8, delete Despite these requests

Para 7, delete all of line 3 & line 4 up to Given this variety of formats

Comments by IHB: The points raised by New Zealand have been taken into account with those made by Canada.

Singapore:

At NAV53, the IHO presented information on the availability of ENCs and its aim of achieving adequate coverage, availability, consistency and quality by 2010. However many delegates pointed out the difficulties of achieving this objective especially the problem of inadequate global ENC coverage. This lack of coverage included the waters of various developing countries and small island States. We are at a watershed in hydrographic history and the IHO should address the issues raised at NAV53 by responding decisively. This includes:

- a) Demonstration of IHO's firm commitment to provide global ENC coverage all the main shipping routes and ports by the target date.
- b) To specify the plans which the IHO would be employing to meet these targets.

As such, the draft NAV54/14/X paper needs to convincingly address the concerns raised at the NAV53 meeting. More relevantly, the paper should reflect the actual status and action plans to address the gaps as well as the concerns raised at the NAV53 meeting. Singapore's comments are reflected in the attached paper.

⁴ SHOM letter N° 184 SHOM/EG dated 6 April 2007.

Comments by IHB: Some text to reflect the concerns raised by Singapore have been included in the submitted paper. Further more detailed responses to the points raised will be presented during the IHO seminar which will be held at the end of the first day of NAV 54.

UK:

With regard to the paper on ENC availability; UK would have preferred more detail within the paper on how IHO is tackling outstanding ENC issues, but recognises the difficulty of doing this within a short paper. We believe that IHO will need to have detailed information to hand at IMO NAV54 to enable response to likely follow up questions. For instance it would be useful to have figures for the last 5 or 6 years for the average price of ENCs to the end user, this would enable us to demonstrate how prices have fallen over time and, by extrapolation, how they may continue to fall with increasing usage.

With regard to the second paper on the online catalogue; UK agrees that IMO should reconsider the requirement to include details of paper chart back up (both for single ECDIS use and as supplement when using the RCDS mode). The inclusion of this information, even if it were available, would complicate the catalogue and make it very difficult to keep up to date. With the increasing coverage of ENCs and with double ECDIS fit becoming more common, this functionality would have limited life and in our view is not worth the considerable effort that would have to be expended to make it operational and maintain it.

Comments by IHB: The points raised by the UK are noted. Following the comments by Australia and France and considering the text used in MSC.232(82), the IHB has removed the request for the Sub-Committee to reconsider the need for "details of paper chart back up (both for single ECDIS use and as supplement when using the RCDS mode)".
