

**9th IHO CAPACITY BUILDING SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING
Niteroi, Brazil, 23-25 May 2011**

IHO Publication C-55
The Status of Hydrographic Surveying and Nautical Charting Worldwide

Paper for consideration by CBSC

Review of States included / or not included and methodology used in determining
information provided.

Submitted by : IHB
Related Documents : IHO Publication C-55

Introduction/ Background

The 3rd Edition of C-55 which was published in 2004 and is maintained on a continuous basis provides information related to the status of hydrographic surveys, nautical charting and the promulgation of Maritime Safety Information (MSI).

Analysis/Discussion

1.- NEED TO DEFINE STATES TO BE INCLUDED IN C-55

When the 3rd Edition was prepared some, but not all, “inland” States were included in the database, however after seven years there is still no data available for the majority of those States. Consequently it is considered timely to review which States should be included in C-55. The rationale for including particular “inland” States when the database was prepared in 2004 is not known but it is considered likely to be based on those States having significant navigable inland waterways.

The introduction to C-55 says:

The purpose of IHO Publication No. 55 (C-55) is to provide base data for governments and supporting international organisations as they consider the best means by which to implement responsibilities set out in Chapter V, Regulation 9, of the Safety of Life at Sea (SOLAS) Convention. It also informs IHO input to the United Nations’ Global Maritime Assessment.

Given this opening statement should C-55 only include those States that are signatories to the SOLAS Convention? This would result in the removal of most of the “inland” States currently included.

Alternatively, should C-55 include those States that are members of the United Nations? If so then the following 19 States would need to be added:

Afghanistan; Andorra; Armenia; Bhutan; Botswana; Burkina Faso;

Kyrgyzstan; Lao, Peoples' Dem Rep; Lesotho; Lichtenstein; Macedonia; Micronesia; Mongolia; Nepal; Rwanda; San Marino; Swaziland; and Tajikistan.

However following this premise the *Cook Islands* and the *Palestinian Authority* which are obviously coastal States and currently included in C-55 should be removed.

"Inland" States currently in C-55 are detailed in Annex A.

2.- NEED TO STANDARDIZE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN C-55

IHO Publication C-55 contains information about the progress of hydrographic surveying and of charting coverage for each country with navigable seas and oceans under its jurisdiction. This is expressed in terms of percentage of coverage. However, it is often difficult to get developing States to provide any up to date information.

Even when data is provided, it is not easy for a reader to determine from the information in C-55 whether the current level of surveying or charting for an area is adequate or in need of action, or to rank one location against another in terms of its surveying or charting priority. Such information would however be most valuable in enabling the IHO and coastal States to better target investment and support for hydrography.

It would be a considerable improvement to the usefulness of C-55 if a standardized analysis and assessment methodology could be developed to indicate whether, in general terms, an area had been surveyed and charted appropriately for contemporary uses.

Noting that obtaining baseline information from individual States is difficult and in some cases effectively impossible, an option might be to relate the chart reliability or source information (and latterly ZOC information) available on published nautical charts with other more subjective factors used by HO's to decide whether further charting or surveying action is required; for example, by taking into account such things as the density and type of traffic using a particular chart, and the complexity and nature of the seabed.

In this way, it may be possible to use the readily available source information publicly available on charts (for example, in the Admiralty chart series) in conjunction with GIS and the development of intelligent, self-learning tools to identify those areas of the world's seas, oceans and coastal passages that require attention. There may, of course, be other methods that would be more suitable to achieve this.

Conclusions

- 1.- C-55 is an important source of information that it conceived to support the establishment of priorities to better achieve SOLAS Regulation 9.
- 2.- C-55 provides information related to some countries, the selection of which, is

not consistent and does not follow any rational approach.

3.- The information that C-55 compiles has been produced following different methodologies. The lack of a standardize procedure does not allow to make an accurate assessment of regional and global status of hydrographic surveying, nautical cartography coverage and MSI provision.

Proposals

1.- ON STATES TO BE INCLUDED IN C-55

a. Noting that the IHO has passed Resolutions recognizing the relevance of the IHO program and its standards on inland navigable waterways, it is proposed that C-55 should acknowledge those States that have significant navigable waters under its jurisdiction. This would therefore include all coastal States as well as some inland States. The introduction to C-55 should be amended accordingly, to read:

The purpose of IHO Publication C-55 is to provide base data for governments and supporting international organisations as they consider the best means by which to implement responsibilities set out in Chapter V, Regulation 9, of the Safety of Life at Sea (SOLAS) Convention. It also informs IHO input to the United Nations' Global Maritime Assessment and provides similar information for those States with navigable inland waters waterways not subject to the requirements of SOLAS.

b. For the sake of clarity and the credibility of C-55, it should be made clear in the relevant tables in C-55 when the data was provided or updated and in particular, where no data has been supplied by the relevant authorities.

c. For the benefit of comparison and to encourage membership of the IHO, it should be made clear in the relevant tables in C-55 where a coastal State is not a Member State of the IHO and it is not contracting party to the SOLAS Convention.

2.- ON STANDARDIZATION OF INFORMATION

Noting the nature of the problem and the importance of establishing a standardize procedure, it is propose to establish a CBSC Working Group tasked to identify a feasible solution to minimize this limitation and to report back to the CBSC10.

Action required of IRCC3

To consider these proposals and to adopt the required actions.

If the establishment of the proposed CBSC WG is agreed, a drafting group should develop the ToR and RoP ideally during the CBSC9 meeting.

To report IRCC3 on the decisions adopted.

=====