

**INTERNATIONAL HYDROGRAPHIC
ORGANIZATION**



**ORGANISATION HYDROGRAPHIQUE
INTERNATIONALE**

IHB File No. S3/6000

**CIRCULAR LETTER 28/2010
30 March 2010**

REVIEW OF THE REPERTORY OF IHO RESOLUTIONS (M-3)

Reference: IHB CL 12/2010 dated 29 January

Dear Hydrographer,

1 The IHB would like to thank the following 46 Member States who replied to the reference: Argentina; Australia; Bahrain; Bangladesh; Belgium; Brazil; Canada; Chile; Croatia; Cuba; Cyprus; Denmark; Ecuador; Egypt; Estonia; Finland; France; Germany; Greece; Iceland; India; Ireland; Italy; Japan; Korea Rep of; Malaysia; Morocco; Netherlands; New Zealand; Norway; Oman; Pakistan; Poland; Portugal; Qatar; Romania; Singapore; Slovenia; Spain; South Africa; Suriname; Sweden; Thailand; Tunisia; UK and the USA. Forty-five Member States supported the adoption of the 2nd Edition of M-3 and one Member State voted no. Eight Member States provided comments and these together with explanatory responses where appropriate are included at Annex A.

2 In accordance with the IHO Convention Article VI paragraph 6, a simple majority of Member States is required to approve the adoption of a publication. This is currently 40 Member States. The 2nd Edition of M-3 in English and French, is now available for download from the IHO web site and the 1st Edition has been withdrawn. The Spanish text of the 2nd Edition is in preparation and will be made available as soon as possible.

On behalf of the Directing Committee

Yours sincerely,

Vice Admiral Alexandros MARATOS,
President

Annex A. Comments by Member States

COMMENTS BY MEMBER STATES

Australia: YES

Australia commends the work done by the IHB in the preparation of the 2nd Edition of M-3.

Regarding TR 2/2007 (formerly A1.21): There is an Action from HSSC1 (HSSC1/14) for the IHB to seek MS approval for a revision of this resolution based on a paper presented at HSSC1 and subsequent discussions. AU recommends this Action be undertaken in sufficient time to permit incorporation of approved changes in the 2nd Edition of M-3 prior to its publication.

Regarding TR 35/1996 (formerly K3.3): There is an Action from HSSC1 (HSSC1/32) for the IHB to seek MS approval for a revision of this resolution based on a paper presented at HSSC1 and subsequent discussions. AU recommends this Action be undertaken in sufficient time to permit incorporation of approved changes in the 2nd Edition of M-3 prior to its publication.

(Editorial) – Section 2.4.1: 1/1952 to end of section: Capitalise text for TR Titles and change text for Reference, Last amendment and 1st Edition Reference to bold face text (to be consistent with other TRs)

Comment by the IHB: Any amendments to TRs adopted since the issue of CL 12/2010 will be included in the 2nd Edition of M-3 on publication. Any future changes or additions will be included in M-3 on adoption. The editorial corrections have been made,

Canada: NO

Canada appreciates very much the work that has gone into this revised 2nd Edition of M-3. The hotlink feature does make the document faster to navigate digitally and there is no problem with the new numbering or organization of the resolutions.

The feature of the old version that is most missed is the organization of the tables of contents at the front of the document and at each significant chapter. In our view it would be better to list a more detailed table of contents and/or the index of resolutions to be organized by title (alphabetically) and if possible by themes (programmes).

A smaller additional point would be to merge the two headers to provide for instance one header that indicates

Title: xxx Reference: xxxx Lat amended: xxxx 1st Edition: xxxx

The new Appendix is helpful and appreciated.

Comment by the IHB: It is agreed that a list of resolutions at the start of each section is very useful and this has been included. This list is also hyperlinked to the relevant resolution. The IHB considers that the inclusion of the "titles" of the headers at the start of each section is sufficient and that users would very quickly be aware of them. This avoids an excessive amount of repetition in the publication.

Finland: YES

Finland thanks the IHB for this very good work and welcomes the new clearly structured edition of M-3.

Editorial comment: There are some old references to M-4 (on pages 16, 38), to M-12 (page 41), to M-13 (page 24). These should be replaced by appropriate new references i.e. S-4, S-12, and C-13.

Comment by the IHB: The references have been amended accordingly.

France: YES

France agrees to the adoption of this new edition of the M-3 and congratulates the IHB on the extent and the quality of the work undertaken.

However, France notes that the new numbering system, based only on those resolutions in force at the date of the new edition, is arbitrary and does not give a uniform overview of the standardisation work carried out over the previous years. France therefore suggests that the IHB considers the feasibility of adopting a numbering system which takes into account all the resolutions adopted over the years and seeks the Member States' opinion on the interest of revising the draft in this way.

Three minor additional suggestions are made:

- As in the case of the IHO work programmes to which the Resolutions are linked, quoted at the top of each page, it would also be good to indicate the title of the corresponding sections in the same way at the top of the relevant pages.
- In section 2.4.1, the titles of the Resolutions are first given in capitals and then in lower case. It would be good to standardize (all titles in capitals);
- In the appendix, it is suggested to replace « résolution supprimée à la xème édition » par « résolution supprimée de la xème édition ».

Finally, the following points are noted just for information:

- The appendix is numbered "1" in the summary (page i) whereas no number appears on the cover page of the appendix.
- The title of the appendix on page i of the summary (Amendment history of resolutions) is different to the title of the appendix (Amendment History of Resolutions of the International Hydrographic Organization).
- In the preface, a full stop is missing after the reference to the resolution 13/1932 (Q3.1) in the 1st paragraph and a space between "M-3" and "had" on the 5th line of the second paragraph.
- In the body of the appendix, only the last two digits of the year of the Circular Letters are indicated whereas in the main text the whole year is indicated, which is better in order to avoid any ambiguity.

Comment by the IHB: The decision to renumber only those resolutions that are currently extant was taken as this constitutes M-3 as it is today. Those resolutions which have already been declared obsolete and deleted are only of historical interest. Anyone wishing to study these can of course consult the Appendix to M-3 where the full history of every resolution is included. The penultimate sentence in the Preface has been amended to make this clearer and now reads: "Tables providing references to the authority for the adoption, amendment and deletion of all Resolutions are published in a separate Appendix to M-3." All other suggestions and corrections proposed by France have been adopted.

Japan: YES

Japan fully supports the adoption of the 2nd Edition of M-3. Japan thinks that the structure and format of the draft 2nd Edition of M-3 facilitates research of a resolution and its history.

Netherlands: YES

Apparently K2.20 to K2.48 have not been transferred.

Comment by the IHB: This is correct. K2.20 – K2.48 contain the Terms of Reference (ToR) for subordinate bodies of the IHO. These ToR are not resolutions and in the case of Working Groups are not approved by Member States, neither are they translated into Spanish. They were included in the English and French editions of M-3 in 2004 as a place of safe keeping. The definitive versions of all ToR are now available from the IHO web page of the relevant subordinate body and the IHB therefore considered it appropriate to remove them from the 2nd Edition of M-3. The IHB apologises for not explaining this in CL 12/2010.

Portugal: YES

The Portuguese Hydrographic Office takes good note of the work completed by the IHB and the Committees and Working Groups of the IHO in the revision of the text of the resolutions published in the 2nd Edition of M-3.

Spain: YES

Concerning the "Appendix" of the Publication M-3, I am giving you hereunder corrections to the Spanish text for a better understanding (editorial amendments):

- In pages i and 5, use "**2.2. Mareas y Nivel del Mar**" instead of "**2.2 Mareas y Niveles del Agua**";
- In pages i and 7, we consider that the title of item 2.3.2 must be "**2.3.2 Cartas Digitales/ENC**" instead of the existing one: "**2.3.2 Digitales/ENCs**", in page i and "**2.3.2 Cartas - Digitales/ENCs**" in page 7;
- In pages i and 8, we consider that the title of item 2.4.2 must be: "**2.4.2 Publicaciones Digitales**" instead of the existing one: "**2.4.2 Digitales**" in page i and "**2.4.2 Publicaciones - Digitales**" in page 8;
- In pages i and 12, use "**2.4.6 Radioseñales**" instead of "**2.4.6 Señales por radio**".

Concerning the draft of the 2nd Edition of M-3, I note the following:

- In Resolution S.1.1 the English text of paragraph 2 refers to the duration of the International Hydrographic Conferences (IHC), which will not exceed one week:

" Normally does not exceed **one week**. If.."

Which was approved in Circular Letters 62 (proposal of Review of IHO Resolutions) and 72/2009 (Approval of Resolutions), but does not meet the proposal which was approved in same Circular Letters 62 and 72/2009 in Spanish, which is of two weeks (Annex A of CL62/2009 and Annex B of CL72/2009):

"... que su duración total no exceda de **dos semanas**. Si...".

Thus, I consider that Spanish and English texts must be the same.

- Editorial amendment: the items *Referencia de la 1^a Edición, Última enmienda y Referencia de las Resoluciones A2.11 a A2.17* are not in **bold**.
- Paragraph 1 b) of resolution F1.6, about the methods to define geographical positions meets the English text approved in the Circular Letter 61/2009 (Annex B, final text of the revised resolutions):

"b) Bearing and distance from a well-defined and permanent charted object.",

But in the same Circular Letter the Spanish text has one more sentence:

"b) Marcación y distancia dadas a partir de un objeto bien definido y permanente representado en la carta, *con la latitud y la longitud aproximadas siempre que sea posible*."

Concerning the IHB comments to the suggestion from France in Circular Letter No. 61/2009, About the correction to Circular Letter No. 43/2009, it is understood that there is a mistake. So, I consider that English and Spanish texts must be the same".

Comments by the IHB: The editorial amendments proposed by Spain have been included. In the case of the changes in title for 4 sections in Spanish in the Appendix these have also been included in the draft text of the 2nd

Edition of M-3 in Spanish. The IHB thanks Spain for identifying the discrepancy between the English and Spanish texts of resolutions F1.6 (19/1919, as amended) and S1.1 (4/1957, as amended) as set out in CLs 61/2009 and 72/2009. In both cases the English text is correct. Corrected versions of these two CLs, in Spanish, will be placed on the IHO web site and forwarded to Spanish speaking Member States. The 2nd Edition of M-3 in Spanish has been amended accordingly.