



IHB File No. S3/8151/S-52

CIRCULAR LETTER 52/2012
21 May 2012

ADOPTION OF NEW EDITIONS OF IHO PUBLICATIONS:

Edition 4.0.0 of S-52 appendix 1 "Guidance on Updating the Electronic Navigational Chart"

Edition 2.0.0 of S-65 "ENCs, Production, Maintenance and Distribution Guidance"

References: a) IHO CL 12/2012 dated 02 February
b) Action HSSC3/18 from the 3rd meeting of the Hydrographic Services and Standards Committee (HSSC)

Dear Hydrographer,

1 The Directing Committee would like to thank the following 46 Member States who replied to Reference a): Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Bahrain, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Croatia, Denmark, Ecuador, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Iceland, India, Iran, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Korea (Rep. of), Latvia, Malaysia, Morocco, Netherlands, Norway, Oman, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom, and United States. All 46 Member States supported the proposed new edition 4.0.0 of S-52 Appendix 1 *Guidance on Updating the Electronic Navigational Chart*, while 45 Member States supported the proposed new edition 2.0.0 of S-65 *ENCs, Production, Maintenance and Distribution Guidance*. Eleven States provided specific comments which, together with explanatory responses where appropriate, are provided in Annex A.

2 At the date of Reference a) there were 80 IHO Member States with two States suspended. Therefore in accordance with paragraph 6 of Article VI of the Convention on the IHO, the majority required for adoption of these new editions is 40. Consequently, edition 4.0.0 of S-52 Appendix 1 and edition 2.0.0 of S-65 are adopted and will be posted in the IHO publications download section of the IHO website shortly.

3 IEC Technical Committee 80 (IEC TC80), which is the responsible committee within IEC for the ECDIS type-approval standard, IEC 61174, was consulted in accordance with Reference b) since this IEC standard includes references to S-52 Appendix 1. The Secretary of IEC TC 80 has indicated that edition 4.0.0 of S-52 Appendix 1 is fully satisfactory in relation to its impact on IEC 61174.

4 In accordance with paragraph 6 of Reference a), the ENC Updating Working Group (EUWG) is now disbanded as it has completed all of its assigned tasks.

On behalf of the Directing Committee
Yours sincerely,

Robert WARD
Director

Annex A: Comments by Member States

COMMENTS BY MEMBER STATES
IN RESPONSE TO CL 12/2012

Canada (commenting on S-65):

1. *Stage 2 - Define ENC Production Requirement - Cell Schema and Design Considerations*

This is a suggestion to possibly improve the document and is not related to the "new" content. In the section "Stage 2", after the discussions on "Compilation Scales " and "Navigational Purposes", it is suggested that some guidance or a reference to guidance, on the determination and implementation of "Usage Bands" be included (the UOC does not address this, either). Perhaps a simple reference to the IHO document CHRIS 15-5-2A "Improving ENC Consistency" would be sufficient.

Comment by IHB: *The EUWG Chair has suggested that the guidance in Stage 2, Step 1, may be appropriate, i.e. "The final assignment of ENCs to navigational purpose codes and the values used for individual SCAMIN attribution should preferably be done through consultation with all ENC Producer States within a Regional Hydrographic Commission as appropriate, in order to maintain consistency across national or regional boundaries". However, Canada's comment will be addressed to TSMAD, the WG responsible for S-65, for consideration during the preparation of the next edition.*

2. *Annex B Guidelines for Typical Cases - j. Change to a maintained depth in a dredged area*

This does not match UOC 3.0 or "EB27 -UOC Clause 5.3 Sounding". If Annex B is not removed as proposed then this content requires updating to reflect approved coding guidelines.

Comment by IHB: *Former Annex B of S-65 has been removed, following its transfer to edition 3.0.0 of S-57 Appendix B.1, Annex A – Use of the Object Catalogue.*

Colombia: It is important to outline that the data capture procedures and the guidelines for updating are described in S-57. This could generate inconsistencies or redundancies in the information contained in some paragraphs. This is why we recommend clarifying them in some parts.

Comment by IHB: *Particular attention was made to avoiding inconsistencies between S-65, being a high level guide to enable hydrographic offices to gain an overview of processes, and other IHO standards, such as S-57 or S-52, although there may exist redundancies across these IHO standards.*

Finland (commenting on S-65): In our opinion, the S-65 belongs more feasible to the C-series of publications because it is by nature a guidance, not a standard.

Comment by IHB: *It is correct that S-65 is a guidance document rather than a standard. Consideration will be given to Finland' suggestion for future issues of S-65.*

France (commenting on S-65): As proposed in the draft version submitted to Member States, edition 2.0.0 of S-65 will need to be enhanced to take account that some of its elements have been included in edition 3.0.0 of S-57 Appendix B.1, Annex A (UOC).

Comment by IHB: *The final text of S-65 edition 2.0.0 takes into consideration the transfer to edition 3.0.0 of S-57 Appendix B.1, Annex A – Use of the Object Catalogue, of the former annexes A and B of S-65.*

India (commenting on S-65): Referring to "Stage 10 – Distribute ENC Data" (page 24), India has been distributing ENCs and respective updates in regular intervals through Primar RENC, UKHO and Jeppesen Norway AS.

Italy: IIM thanks EUWG for the useful work done.

Japan (commenting on S-65): Japan reiterates its position to issue ENC Updates with more than 50 kB in size, if necessary, as we have been encountering some cases where legacy ECDIS or ENC viewers cannot handle EN very well rather than ER. They are able to handle more than 50 kB ER. But we would not challenge on the text on page 21 of the S-65 draft as it has the phrase “As a guide”.

Comment by IHB: As mentioned in Stage 9, Step 2, the 50 kB limit is only a recommendation.

Portugal: IHPT wants to congratulate IHB in general and EUWG in particular, for its valuable work done in the preparation of the new editions of S-65 and S-52 Appendix 1.

Thailand (commenting on S-65): We do not agree with the text in page 24 of S-65 that reads “It is recommended that all ENC data (New ENCs, New Editions, Updates, and Re-issue) is distributed through a Regional ENC Co-ordinating Centre (RENC)”. We encountered the problem of which country should be selected as the RENC, therefore, should leave the issue to be the distribution policy of each hydrographic office.

Comment by IHB: The above sentence (13th bullet of Stage 10, Step 1) is in line with IHO Resolution 1/1997, as amended, which states at its paragraph 2.c “Member States are encouraged to distribute their ENCs through a RENC in order to share in common experience and reduce expenditure, and to ensure the greatest possible standardization, consistency, reliability and availability of ENCs”.

United Kingdom (commenting on S-65): Please see the attached comments which are mainly related to grammar.

Page 3, Paragraph 2

An Electronic Chart Display and Information System (ECDIS) will convert the ENC and its updates into ~~its own native~~ System ENC (SENC) ~~format in an~~ The SENC ~~internal~~ format is optimised by the ECDIS manufacture for the correct and efficient display of ENC information.

Page 21, Step 2, Bullet Point 1

Updating must ~~to~~ be completed within a rigid timescale for ENC cells that have been issued to customers.

Page 21, Step 2, Bullet Point 3

ENC Updates must be produced ~~so as~~ which fully ~~to~~ replicate the corrections ~~to on~~ the equivalent paper chart(s), and ~~be distributed produced~~ at the same frequency, e.g. ~~time whether that is~~ weekly, fortnightly or monthly.

Page 22, Step 5, Bullet Point 1

The timely distribution of ~~the~~ ENC data can be on CD-ROM, through the Internet, over ~~SATCOMSINMARSAT~~, or by landline communication. However, see Stage 10 regarding wider distribution principles.

Page 23, Step 1, Bullet Point 5

The distribution mechanism must provide existing users with regular updates, e.g. ENC New Editions, Re-issues or Updates, to ensure that the ECDIS SENC is maintained up to date. In the case of remote supply, data transmission can be optimized by ~~sending providing~~ only the additional ENC data necessary to bring the SENC up to date ~~required data~~.

Page 23, Step 1, Bullet Point 6

The distribution mechanism should issue information about the current status of all ENCs in service (latest edition and update number), ~~ENCs~~ cancelled ENCs, and where appropriate, replaced ENCs.

Page 23, Step 1, Bullet Point 8

Methods of delivering ~~ing~~ may include the use of physical media or ~~remotely using the internet, Satellite Communication, etc. telecom (on line), on land or at sea.~~

Page 23, Step 1, Bullet Point 10

As a minimum, all ENC data must be made available on CDROM. On demand and remote services ~~via telecom~~ may also be utilised ~~should also be made available and~~ however a nil message ~~must should~~

be supplied ~~used~~ if no additional update information is available ~~exists~~. These services should ensure that service continuity and data integrity is not in conflict with data already installed using conventional methods, e.g. CDROM.

***Comment by IHB:** We thank UK for its suggested improvements which have been taken into account when finalizing the new edition.*

United States: As both S-52 Appendix 1 and S-65 are guidance documents which provide recommended actions, the United States recommend replacing the word “must” with the word “should” when indicating steps to be taken by a Hydrographic Office.

***Comment by IHB:** As in the previous editions of S-65, the word “must” is used to stress that the relevant recommendation is stronger than when “should” is used. However, noting the guidance character of this document, this matter, i.e. the use of “must” vs “should”, will be reconsidered at the occasion of the next edition. Regarding S-52 Appendix 1, the new edition only quotes parts of IEC 61174 and MSC232(88) which therefore cannot be changed.*