



IHB File No. S3/8151/HSSC

**CIRCULAR LETTER 84/2012
29 August 2012**

**RESOLUTIONS OF THE IHO (M-3)
Approval of an Amendment to IHO Resolution 2/2007**

**“Principles and Procedures for making changes to IHO Technical
Standards and Specifications”**

- References:
- a) IHO Circular Letter 60/2012/rev1 dated 6 June
 - b) IHO Circular Letter 63/2012 dated 14 June
 - c) IHO Circular Letter 87/2010 dated 13 December

Dear Hydrographer,

1 Reference a) circulated a proposed amendment to IHO Resolution 2/2007, to include a list of publications that should be subject to the terms of this resolution, including the IHO Universal Hydrographic Data Model S-100. Reference b) proposed including in the list additional IHO publications, under the responsibility of IRCC.

2 The IHB would like to thank all Member States who replied to the References, as listed below:

- Reference a): the following 45 Member States: Algeria, Argentina; Australia; Belgium; Brazil; Canada; Chile; Croatia; Cuba; Denmark; Estonia; Finland; France; Germany; Greece; Guatemala; Iceland; India; Ireland; Italy; Japan; Korea (Republic of); Malaysia; Mexico; Netherlands; Norway; Oman; Peru; Philippines; Poland; Portugal; Romania; Singapore; Slovenia; South Africa; Spain; Sri Lanka; Suriname; Sweden; Tunisia; Turkey; Ukraine; United Kingdom, United States and Uruguay. Of these, 44 Member States supported the proposed amendment, one State did not support it. Five States provided comments.
- Reference b): the following 44 Member States: Algeria, Argentina; Australia; Bahrain; Belgium; Brazil; Canada; Chile; Croatia; Cuba; Denmark; Estonia; Finland; France; Germany; Greece; Guatemala; Iceland; India; Ireland; Italy; Japan; Korea (Republic of); Malaysia; Mexico; Netherlands; Nigeria; Norway; Peru; Philippines; Poland; Portugal; Romania, Singapore; Slovenia; South Africa; Spain; Suriname; Sweden; Turkey; Ukraine; United Kingdom, United States and Uruguay. Of these, 41 Member States supported the inclusion in the list of the proposed additional publications, three States did not support this inclusion. Five States provided comments.

All comments from Member States, together with supplementary remarks from the IHB in some cases, are provided in Annex A.

3 There are currently 81 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 the revised resolution is 40. Consequently the amendments to Resolution 2/2007, as proposed by the References, have been adopted and the resulting revised Resolution 2/2007 will be incorporated in Publication M-3 *Resolutions of the IHO* in the near future.

4 As reported in Reference c), IHO Publication S-4 *Chart Specifications for the IHO and Regulations for International (INT) Charts* will be included in the list at Appendix 1 of Resolution 2/2007, with CSPCWG as the “Relevant maintenance body”, when the current cycle of revising S-4 has been completed.

On behalf of the Directing Committee
Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Robert Ward', with a period at the end.

Robert WARD
Director

Annex A: Comments by Member States

COMMENTS BY MEMBER STATES

AUSTRALIA (CL 60) – Voted YES

While Australia supports the amendments to the resolution, it still has reservations over the appropriateness of including S-100, as discussed in the Australian response to CL 3/2012 and hopes that this can be revisited if circumstances change.

FINLAND (CL 60) – Voted YES

S-65 belongs more logically to the C-series of publications because it is by nature a guidance document, not a standard. Also S-66 seems to be by nature more a guidance document including guidance, explanations and references to other specifications, and thus not a standard and may more appropriately belong to the C-series.

FRANCE (CLs 60 & 63) – Voted YES

France approves the proposed amendments with the following comment:

France recalls from the discussions at the XVIIIth IHC and at IRCC4 that it was up to the IHB to prepare the framework to adapt the C-55 data base to the new requirements, and this in liaison with the RHC, CBSC, the GGC and the MSDIWG.

Taking into account the structuring implications of this data base (C-55) and metrication, as a standard, that it aims to establish, it is proposed to add this “standard” in the planned list as Appendix 1 to the Resolution 2/2007 as amended, with the IHB as “the relevant body in terms of updating”, by default, as long as a new procedure has not been defined.

Remarks by IHB:

The C-55 database will be a collection of data provided by Member States and by others. In that respect it will be a compilation of facts, more like P-5 - *IHO Year Book* or S-11 Part B - *Catalogue of International (INT) Charts*. As such, it may not be appropriate to treat changes to the contents of the data base under the terms of Resolution 2/2007.

INDIA (CL 63) – Voted NO

Any revision to B6 and S23 need Member States' approval especially where the Naming and Limits of Seas and Oceans are involved. Hence these two documents should not be included in Annex A.

Remarks by IHB:

Resolution 2/2007 requires Member States to approve any changes.

KOREA (REP. OF) (CL 63) – Voted NO

The Republic of Korea considers that the publication of the 4th edition of S-23 should not be subject to the terms of IHO Resolution 2/2007 for the following reasons:

Since the adoption of Resolution K3.2 (now renumbered 32/1919) in 1979, all IHO member States have exerted utmost efforts to make progress toward the publication of the 4th edition of S-23. As a result, a comprehensive draft of the 4th edition was presented in 2002. Taking into account the substantial progress made so far as well as the interests of the Member States in completing the publication process in the nearest future, it would be inappropriate to apply the terms of the Resolution to the publication process, the work for which had started many years before the adoption of the Resolution.

In addition, under the terms of Resolution 2/2007, the countries directly concerned have little opportunity to express and reflect their views in the process. Given that S-23 is a publication that sets the standards for the names and the limits of the seas, it is important that the views of the littoral states be fully respected in its revision. This view has been confirmed by many Member States at the

18th IHC held in Monaco in April 2012, where it was emphasized that the agreement among the countries directly involved is essential in the process of the publication of the new edition.

Lastly, Resolution 2/2007 provides that the old standard is valid until a new or changed standard takes effect. However, as the report of IHB to the 18th IHC (CONF.18/WP.1/Add.1) clearly states, the 3rd edition of S-23, which was published in 1953 and has not been revised for nearly 60 years, is completely out of date and ineffective. In light of this, the Republic of Korea considers that the application of Resolution 2/2007 to the publication of the 4th edition of S-23 would not be appropriate.

MEXICO (CL 60) – Voted YES

This addition of Appendix 1 requires a new item to be included in the *"Principles and Procedures for Making Changes to IHO Technical Standards and Specifications"*.

New editions or technical publications could make it inappropriate because of being outdated. We therefore propose the inclusion of the following item:

"Item 3.3. HSSC should review Appendix 1 - the list of technical IHO Standards, at each meeting, including the timing for mandatory updates."

Remarks by IHB:

The IHB, as the publisher of all IHO publications, monitors the maintenance status of every IHO publication. In addition, HSSC is provided with a status report at each meeting that covers all the IHO publications under the governance of the HSSC.

PORTUGAL (CLs 60 & 63) – Voted NO

Considering that the initial motivation for this amendment is the exemption of S-100 from the formal approval by MS and that additional publications are being proposed for exemption of IHO Resolution 2/2007, this will give room for further proposals of amendment.

Therefore, we agree with the IHB reservations that this approach will introduce a significant change to the governance and approval process of IHO standards.

TURKEY (CL 60) – Voted YES

If the amendments are agreed, Member States should be informed in the announcement CL that S-4 (CSPCWG, as the relevant maintenance body) will be added to the list in Appendix-1 of Resolution 2/2007 after its current revision will be completed.

Remarks by IHB:

CL 87/2010 has already reported that S-4 would be subject to the terms of Resolution 2/2007 after the current cycle of revision of S-4 has been completed (paragraph 4 of this CL refers). A reminder has been included in this circular letter.

UNITED STATES (CL 63) – Voted YES

DIPWG Terms of Reference state that DIPWG should:

"Maintain IHO Special Publication S-52, its accompanying Presentation Library and the portrayal related elements of IHO Special Publications S-100 and S-101..."

Therefore, the US recommends that the S-100 row of the table in the appendix 1 of the amended resolution be modified as follows:

S-100	IHO Universal Hydrographic Data Model Section 9 and other Portrayal related elements of S-100	TSMAD DIPWG
-------	--	----------------

Remarks by IHB:

The US comment is also valid for DQWG which has responsibility for the Quality related elements of S-100 (and S-101). The “Relevant maintenance body” for S-100 will therefore be amended to read “TSMAD, DIPWG and DQWG”.

URUGUAY (CL 60 and 63) – Voted YES

Propose to include: C-13 - *Manual of Hydrography*

S-4 - *Regulations for International (INT) Charts and Chart Specifications of the IHO*

Remarks by IHB:

CL 87/2010 has already reported that S-4 would be subject to the terms of Resolution 2/2007 after the current cycle of revision of S-4 has been completed (paragraph 4 of this CL refers). A reminder has been included in this circular letter.

C-13 is, in effect, a text book rather than a standard.