

**7<sup>th</sup> COMMISSION ON THE PROMULGATION  
OF RADIO NAVIGATIONAL WARNINGS MEETING  
IHB, Monaco, 13-15 Sep 2005**

**SUMMARY REPORT**

*Note: Paragraph numbering is the same as in the agenda (Annex A).*

**1 OPENING REMARKS AND ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS**

**1.1 Opening Remarks and Introductions**

The Chairman of the Commission (Mr. Peter Doherty, United States (NGA)) opened the 7<sup>th</sup> CPRNW Meeting at 0930 hours on Tuesday 13 Sep 2005. Representatives of 12 IHO Member States, the IHB, and four Ex-Officio members (WMO, IMO, IMSO, and Inmarsat) were in attendance. Of the 12 Member States represented, 9 were NAVAREA Coordinators and 1 was a Sub-Area Coordinator. The list of participants at the meeting is given in Annex B.

**1.2 Welcome by the IHB**

The Chairman welcomed the participants and then called on the President of the IHB, Vice Admiral Alexandros Maratos, to address the meeting.

After welcoming all participants, the President expressed sincere interest in the papers submitted and informed the commission on the changes to the IHB that in are currently in work. Meetings have been held to discuss how existing committees and working groups will be realigned under the new organizational structure. An official report is due to the SPWG which will meet in December of 2005 in Mexico, with the goal of the establishment of the 2 committees and organizational structure to be in place before the 2007 IHO Ordinary Conference. Captain Gorziglia of the IHB will be speaking with the Chairman of the CPRNW in the future to identify where CPRNW will be placed in the new IHO structure.

**1.3 Working Arrangements**

The Chairman welcomed the delegates and expressed his appreciation for all the efforts of the Commission in developing and guiding the implementation of the Global Maritime Distress and Safety System (GMDSS) in the World-Wide Navigational Warning Service. The group agreed to its hours of work and other necessary working arrangements.

**1.4 Administrative Arrangements**

Mr. Steve Shipman, Professional Assistant for Hydrography of the IHB, covered some of the administrative arrangements regarding the meeting, evening social, and group picture and stressed that the staff of the IHB was available to assist the delegates at any time.

## **1.5 Adoption of the Agenda**

The Chairman stated that the agenda was very full and identified several of the key items that would be discussed over the next three days which have effect on all aspects of the promulgation of navigational warnings in the GMDSS. He also noted that the agenda would have to be flexible in order to allow for certain Commission representatives who had other commitments to be present for key discussion points where their individual knowledge, experience, and expertise would be valuable to that particular agenda item.

The Commission adopted the agenda. A copy of the meeting agenda and a listing of all the papers submitted are located at Annexes A and E respectively.

## **2 MATTERS RELATING TO THE GMDSS MASTER PLAN**

### **2.1 GMDSS Master Plan**

The Chairman stressed the importance of the GMDSS and the role of the IHO in it. He noted that it was the responsibility of the Commission to ensure that the GMDSS provision for the promulgation of radio navigational warnings was fully implemented and that all deficiencies were corrected and that appropriate revisions were effected in the relevant documents.

The IMO stated the new final version of the GMDSS Master Plan is now available in PDF format. This is entitled “Master Plan of Shore-Based Facilities for the Global Maritime Distress and Safety System (GMDSS Master Plan)” and lists the operational and planned facilities. The current edition is *GMDSS/Circ. 8* and it is kept up-to-date by the issuance of periodic corrigenda.

The IMO invited its Member Governments to continuously examine the information on the national shore-based facilities and to submit any amendments to IMO to ensure that the Master Plan is kept up-to-date. The form for submitting amendments can be found at Annex 14 of the Master Plan or as an attachment to MSC/Circ.684.

The Chairman reminded the members that many national hydrographic offices or Telecommunications Authorities produce *Lists of Radio Signals* that are routinely maintained by *Notice to Mariners*. With this fact in mind, a decision had been taken at the 3<sup>rd</sup> CPRNW meeting that all of these publications should be accepted as meeting the carriage requirements of SOLAS Chapter V. Approval that the *Lists of Radio Signals* met the carriage requirements of SOLAS Chapter V was obtained at COMSAR 1 (See COMSAR 1/30, paragraph 5.7 for exact text. MSC approval was given in MSC 66/24, paragraph 10.1).

The Chairman also stated that paragraph 6.2.1.16 of the IMO/IHO World-Wide Navigational Warning Service Guidance Document (S-53) outlines the responsibilities of the NAVAREA Coordinator. It should be the basis for taking a more proactive posture in the co-ordination of discussions between Member States seeking to establish NAVTEX, or SafetyNET in lieu of NAVTEX, services in their area.

## **3 PROMULGATION OF MARITIME SAFETY INFORMATION (MSI)**

### **3.1 Results of 9th Session of IMO COMSAR**

The Chairman provided a summary of the activities of the IHO CPRNW at the 9<sup>th</sup> session of COMSAR at IMO HQ London, Feb 2005. The Chairman noted that many papers were submitted and discussed which had applicability to the work of the Commission. Specifically the Chairman discussed the paper submitted by the IHO that addressed potential changes to WWNWS guidance documents in order to include specific language for the promulgation of warnings for tsunamis and other natural disasters.

The Chairman noted that the Sub-Committee on Radiocommunications and Search and Rescue (COMSAR) considered the promulgation of warnings for tsunamis and other natural disasters using the existing International SafetyNET and/or NAVTEX systems and agreed to the following guidance which was published in COMSAR/Circ.36, pending a future review of resolution A.706(17) on the World-Wide Navigational Warning Service:

- Tsunami Warning Centres and those who may seek to broadcast warnings as a result of natural disasters (natural disaster warnings) may make use of the existing International SafetyNET system. As a first step each Tsunami Warning Centre and those who may seek to broadcast natural disaster warnings should register with the IMO International SafetyNET Co-ordinating Panel to obtain a certificate of authorization.
- NAVAREA and National Co-ordinators in the affected areas, or areas likely to be affected, upon receipt of any tsunami warnings or of any other natural disaster warnings should immediately re-broadcast such warnings using the highest priority and all existing means as appropriate.
- In the interim and until Tsunami Warning Centres are established and registered, those responsible for issuing tsunami or natural disaster warnings may use the World-Wide Navigational Warning Service (WWNWS) to broadcast such warnings both regionally and locally. This may be achieved by passing the warnings to be broadcasted to the NAVAREA or National Co-ordinators for the affected areas, or areas likely to be affected.
- NAVAREA and National Co-ordinators in the affected areas or areas likely to be affected should consider tsunami warnings and warnings for other natural disasters as exceptional circumstances and should immediately broadcast such warnings using the highest priority and all existing means as appropriate.
- Ships, when within affected areas, should consider immediate re-broadcasting of any tsunami warnings and/or any other natural disaster warnings they might receive using all available means (e.g. VHF radio) as appropriate. In addition, ships should consider activating any emergency response procedures and arrangements they deem necessary and to prepare, depending on the circumstances, for the conduct of search and rescue operations. Ships should also consider, in the light of the prevailing circumstances, the need for changes to planned navigational routes.

The Chairman then invited the representative from WMO to provide an in-depth brief on the current activities of JCOMM and an overview of the IOC Tsunami Program. Key points made during the presentation included:

- The IOC Tsunami Programme (ITSU) has been protecting the Pacific Ocean region for over 40 years. This system is based on Regional & National Tsunami Warning Centres (TWC), with the support of the International Tsunami Information Centre (ITIC)

- A diagram that depicted the flow and decision making process in the evaluation of natural disasters and the issuance of bulletins and warnings (based on real-time seismic and sea-level monitoring).
- The IOC was requested to establish an Indian Ocean Tsunami Warning System (IOTWS) at the 23<sup>rd</sup> session of IOC Assembly in June of 2005.
- The JMA (Japan Meteorological Agency) and the PTWC (Pacific Tsunami Warning Centre) already provide, on an interim basis, tsunami advisories for the Indian Ocean, based only on seismic detection.
- Recognition of the COMSAR/Circ. 36 that authorized the use of SafetyNET for broadcast warning of tsunami of significance to ocean navigation and coastal waters where NAVTEX does not exist.
- The necessity for coordination across IMO, IHO, WMO and the IOC to ensure an effective process.

The Chairman and other members of the Commission further discussed and expanded on examples of other relevant issues with regards to the promulgation of tsunami and natural disaster type messages utilizing WWNWS communication capabilities that included:

- Type of message
- Priority status of message
- Content and format of message
- Definition of responsibilities
- Coordination mechanism and protocol
- Specific actions to be taken by mariners upon receipt

The Chairman next invited NAVAREA X to present its paper CPRNW 2005/3/13 and titled "Tsunami Warning Broadcast". Key points made during the discussion included:

- That the public good was clearly behind the decision by COMSAR 9 and COMSAR/Circ. 36 to encourage the rebroadcast of tsunami warnings/advisories via the GMDSS SafetyNET service.
- It was not clear how warning information concerning small Pacific countries in Navarea X which are not party to ITSU, will be captured for promulgation via SafetyNET.
- Until this matter is resolved, and as an interim measure, the Navarea X coordinator (AMSA), in consultation with the Bureau of Meteorology will continue to broadcast relevant extracts from tsunami warnings/advisories provided by the PTWC.
- An interim arrangement for generating brief tsunami advisories, suitable for SafetyNET messaging, has been developed between the Bureau of Meteorology and AMSA. In practical terms, this will involve interpreting ATAS and eventually ATWS advisories/warnings into a form suitable for broadcast to shipping, together with an assessment of their status (advisories or warnings) and related broadcast priority.
- It is also NAVAREA X's view that the more permanent coordination arrangements need to be jointly developed by IMO, IHO, WMO and the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC). Additionally, they recommended that it would be extremely useful for the CPRNW to establish a

joint IMO-IHO-WMO-IOC working group to determine the most appropriate way to implement the more permanent arrangements.

The Chairman finally invited the NAVAREA I Coordinator, who represented the IHO at an IOC meeting that was held in Paris in March of 2005, to present his findings.

The NAVAREA I Coordinator first reminded the Commission and clarified that tsunamis are predominately hazards to ships in port and coastal areas and that ships at sea are not likely to be affected. In addition, he noted the original intent of COMSAR/Circ. 36 was to provide an interim communication capability. These positions were both supported by the Chairman and President of the IHB.

The NAVAREA I Coordinator then noted that a complete Tsunami Warning System consists of a real-time quake monitoring capability, a real-time sea level and wave monitoring capability, bathymetric models of coastal areas that can be used for analysis, and finally a communication system for promulgation of warnings in order to emphasize the point that the communication aspect is just one part of a tsunami warning system. He also emphasized that the responsibility for preparing such warnings belonged to national authorities and not NAVAREA Coordinators.

NAVAREA IX suggested that the Meteorological Dept. or the competent authority / Govt. shall issue tsunami warnings, concerned NAVAREA Coordinators in response will immediately disseminate this warning/information through all available resources such as SafetyNET or NAVTEX for the information of all mariners.

NAVAREA XI discussed their coordination of Tsunami warnings which are promulgated as urgent natural disaster warnings via NAVTEX.

After all discussion on this matter was concluded, the Chairman agreed to the Australian position that a special joint IMO-IHO-WMO-IOC working group should be established, but that it was not appropriate for the CPRNW to take the lead role. The Chairman explained that the definitive role of NAVAREA Coordinators is post-Tsunami and the promulgation of MSI with regards to aids to navigation as it affects the safe navigation of ships.

The President of the IHB then stated that the original intent was not to develop an IMO/IHO solution for an IOTWS but to simply provide the capabilities and services of the WWNWS for dissemination of Tsunami warnings. The Commission agreed with this position and then centered discussion on whether or not Tsunami warnings are navigational or meteorological in nature.

The WMO representative recommended a working group be established to look at all issues that had been discussed and make recommendations that affect all interested organizations. Issues to be resolved include:

- Are Tsunami Warnings a Navigational Warning or a Meteorological Warning?
- What role is expected of the WWNWS – warnings to vessels at sea and/or port or as an information vehicle for national authorities to promulgate messages?
- Provide consistency and understanding in IOC, WMO, IHO, and IMO as to exactly what is each organizations role.
- Evaluate the actions required to implement the COMSAR/Circ. 36 decision to initiate operational transmission of tsunami warning information to shipping via the GMDSS SafetyNET service
- Ensure that the priority (status), format and contents of the SafetyNET broadcasts meet the requirements of shipping for information about the

tsunami hazard and that the messages about the likely impact during a warning event are well targeted and plainly understood.

The Chairman agreed that the CPRNW would support this working group and that any findings and recommendations would be submitted to COMSAR as a joint paper by the IMO SafetyNET and NAVTEX Coordinating Panels. It was also agreed that working group members would include all members of the CPRNW, the Chairman for the IMO SafetyNET Coordinating Panel, the Chairman for the IMO NAVTEX Coordinating Panel, and representatives from the WMO, IOC, and IMSO.

### **3.2 Actions arising from NAVAREA Assessments of Navigational Warning Services by Coordinators**

Under this agenda item, the Commission noted the Self-Assessments provided by the countries in attendance and from several of those that were unable to attend. These reports highlighted their experiences, problems and successes in implementing the GMDSS for navigational warnings within their respective service areas. The reports also discussed, wherever possible, feedback from users on their views on the efficiency and value of the services provided. The Commission agreed that these assessments represented very valuable operational experiences and requested that the Chairman formally include them as part of his report. In respects to reducing the size of the minutes, it was agreed that the Self-Assessments would be posted at the IHO website: [www.iho.shom.fr](http://www.iho.shom.fr)

User feedback is essential for all Information Providers. In this context, the Chairman urged the Commission to continue to make every effort to obtain this information and to pass along to the other Information Providers any comments they may obtain relating to these other services.

The Chairman offered the opportunity for each representative to present their NAVAREA Self-Assessment. NAVAREA X noted their interest in the submissions from other countries, identified the need for consistency in what was being presented, and finally recommended a revision of the Self-Assessment template. The Chairman agreed to the proposal and notified the Commission that he would submit a draft template to be used for Self-Assessment submissions for the next CPRNW Conference.

NAVAREA X asked the NAVAREA XI Coordinator as to what was meant by their indication in their self-assessment report of transmitting 103 “management” messages. NAVAREA XI offered that these messages were part of the weekly in-force messages.

### **3.3 Coastal Warnings**

#### **3.3.1 Report of the NAVTEX Coordinating Panel**

The Commission noted and endorsed the Report of the Chairman of the NAVTEX Coordinating Panel on the status of NAVTEX services.

The NAVTEX Coordinating Panel has been focusing on the following areas:

- Persuading nations, who have not made coordination efforts and provisions prior to submission request for new NAVTEX stations to do so as per WNWNS guidance documents

- The fundamental issue as to whether a new NAVTEX station that is to be established is a national asset or an international asset of the coordinated WWNWS service
- Management of transmission overruns and interference
- Data formatting of meteorological forecast messages
- English and National Language transmission issues

There was notable discussion with regards to the dual language transmission of NAVTEX messages in English and a national language. It was discovered that some of the guidance documents provide for the allowance of both English and national language transmissions which is in conflict with other guidance documents. It was further recommended that the Chairman of the NAVTEX Coordinating Panel may wish to track the metrics with regards to which countries transmit in English and national languages.

The Chairman of the NAVTEX Coordinating Panel reminded the members that NAVTEX is for coastal warnings and is not designed for local warnings which should be promulgated via other methods and aren't even considered to be part of the WWNWS.

The Chairman concluded that there is confusion and contradiction in the WWNWS guidance documents and recognized the need to establish a correspondence group to ensure that a thorough review of all is conducted. His recommendation included that the IMO SafetyNET and NAVTEX Coordinating Panels lead this effort commencing after COMSAR 10, to be held in March 2006, to ensure that any changes to WWNWS Guidance Documents as a result of this conference are considered. Any recommended and proposed changes to any WWNWS guidance documentation as a result of this working group will be forwarded to all members of the CPRNW for comment prior to approval.

### **3.3.2 Provision by SafetyNET**

The Chairman spoke to a couple of issues. Hurricane Katrina and devastation – there is a NAVTEX station in New Orleans (NOLA) and all personnel were told to evacuate and the station was damaged. NAVAREA IV is now promulgating NOLA NAVTEX using SafetyNET. Guidance is offered in 4.2.1.2 in Publication S53. The IMSO identifies that there is also a SafetyNET look-alike for areas where there is no NAVTEX coverage through which messages would go out as coastal warnings. This information was noted and appreciated.

Also discussed by the Chairman was the US/NAVAREA IV and XII participation at the IHO Capacity Building conference in Cartagena, Columbia. A presentation was delivered on MSI responsibilities of NAVAREA Coordinators. Barbados, St Kitts, Antigua, Mexico, and others have now begun to send information as a result of this outreach. The Chairman encouraged all other NAVAREA to do the same and to reach out to nations within their NAVAREA and to attend regional MSI meetings if possible

IMSO identifies that this encourages other countries to make a start in MSI as there is not much of a political drive in developing countries to do this. The Chairman further added that the exchange of information with MSI will migrate into permanent exchange of information for Notice to Mariners and publication information and all have an opportunity to do this.

Other issues included redundancy with regards to SafetyNET. The Chairman noted the possibility of catastrophic results and what would you do as a NAVAREA Coordinator if your operations were compromised. NAVAREA IV explained that they have a Business Continuity Plan in place and the Chairman encourages all others to do the same. The “Common Presentation CD-ROM” can also be used as part of a BCP.

Discussion from NAVAREA I centered on Coastal Warning areas over SafetyNET. Specifically in regards to the UK and its dependent territories in other areas and NAVAREAs. It is unclear in the SafetyNET manual on how do we set these up, how do we manage them, can they overlap, what is requirement to pass information and do we need to adjust areas. IMSO offered to address these issues and agreed to provide a formal brief at the next session. Inmarsat representative will cover this subject in his presentation.

NAVAREA II stated that they have already experienced this issue and NAVAREA X stated that France did come to them for New Caledonia and NAVAREA X was happy to broadcast for Salomon Islands and Papua New Guinea, etc – but financially they received no compensation. Financial concerns are a good point.

IMSO stated they will draft text for contingency planning for inclusion into the Chairman's "Common Presentation CD-ROM".

NAVAREA X noted that SafetyNET coastal broadcast areas should be set up prior to an emergency need and made known to the mariner. In addition, the SafetyNET areas should be the same as the existing NAVTEX area with the same character code. Need to ensure that we do not have overlapping areas.

IMSO clarifies the point that if you need to use SafetyNET coastal broadcasts in lieu of NAVTEX you do not need to have prior areas established. IMSO also suggested that as part of the document review to include a specific example of this type of message in S53. Inmarsat informed that if it is required, they can broadcast a Service Announcement addressed to all ships advising about a new SafetyNET service. It was noted that National Coordinators need to know that they can contact NAVAREA Coordinators for assistance and as part of their assessment a determination of how long they will be inoperable. IMSO recommends that in future contract agreement some sort of contingency planning language should be included between the LES and the NAVAREA coordinator.

### **3.4 Operational Lessons Learned for Consideration as Improvements to the WWNWS**

#### **3.4.1 MSI Outside Limits of the WWNWS**

##### **3.4.1.1 Arctic Expansion**

The Chairman noted that there is now growing evidence that the ice cover in the Arctic Ocean and northern seas is decreasing, both in mass and area extent. Such a change in the Arctic environment logically inspires concepts for military and commercial maritime exploitation of the area, and motivates increased research in the ocean. Since increased use of the Arctic region is being realized by all elements of society - commercial, military and scientific - it is appropriate that the Arctic Ocean be as respected as the other temperate oceans and navigated with concern for the presence of maritime hazards.

When the boundaries for the NAVAREAs under the WWNWS were decided upon, Maritime Safety Information (MSI) broadcast facilities were not envisioned for the Arctic Region. Therefore, as the opening of the Northern Sea Route for international shipping increases, gaps and problems with MSI broadcasts will be encountered. The northern limits for existing NAVAREA's under the WWNWS are:

- At 67°N just north of the Bering Strait,



- At 67°N across the Davis Strait between Greenland and Canada; and
- At 71°N across the Norwegian and East Greenland Seas, from the Norwegian North Cape to the Greenland Coast.

The Chairman invited the representative from the Russian Federation to present the paper CPRNW 2005/3/02 titled “Establishment of Two New NAVAREA in Arctic Seas”. Key points identified during the brief included:

- Norway has found the Russian Federation proposal problematic as it should have been a coordinated proposal and only deals with a limited area of the arctic seas. Norway does agree that establishment of the NAVAREA in this area is important, but cannot support Russian proposal. (As reported in MSC 80/24 paragraphs 13.22 and 13.23)
- NAVAREA XIII was not involved or coordinated with regards to this recommendation.

The Chairman then noted the historical background of this initiative and presented the graphic from his paper CPRNW 2005/3/5 titled “Extension of the WorldWide Navigational Warning Service to the Arctic Waters” which identified new NAVAREAs across the entire Arctic Region and included the new proposed Russian Federation NAVAREAs. Key points made from this presentation included:

- We should look at whole Arctic and not just parts of the Arctic. It was further clarified that the Delineation of NAVAREAs does not carry any political agreement between states as per WWNWS Guidance Documents.
- WMO and the METAREAs need to also be coordinated with. Their requirements may very well affect where the boundaries have to be drawn. The representative from the WMO was asked to discuss this at the conference next week in Halifax, Canada.
- Norway and Canada were both invited to this CPRNW meeting but were unable to attend. The Chairman has communicated the responsibilities and resource requirements of becoming a NAVAREA Coordinator to Canada.

The NAVAREA I Coordinator noted that the establishment of new NAVAREAs can be broken down into 2 issues – 1 is coordination of activities (NAVAREA Coordinator responsibilities via SP-53) and the issue of communications. MSI currently only has coverage via NAVTEX and SafetyNET (HF-Morse has been deleted). Principle concern is that communication means to meet requirements across entire NAVAREA up to the Arctic polar regions do not exist.

The IMSO representative identified a possible solution would be to identify these Pre-operational services declaration – not 100% operational and this gives NAVAREA Coordinator the opportunity to develop resources and become fully operational. Also as a result of IMO Resolution 888 and if other satellite providers are allowed to participate in the GMDSS, the important thing to note is that none of them have geostationary orbit satellites and many have low earth orbits that do have polar coverage. The WWNWS may be able to use other service providers over polar regions. Currently, no service provider can provide broadband Internet service in polar areas yet.

The Ministry of Transport (Federal State Unitary Hydrographic Department - FSUHD) of the Russian Federation reported that they are the provider of Maritime Safety Information in Arctic seas in the zone of the Northern Sea Route (limited in the west by the western entrances to the Novaya Zemlya Straits and the meridian running north through Mys Zhelaniya, round from the west of Zemlya Franz – Josef Islands and by meridian 168° 58' 37" W in the east. Eight hydrographic Formations of the FSUHD - a sources of navigational information - are disposed along the northern coast of Russia from Arkhangelsk to Provideniya. The State Scientific – Research Institute of the Arctic and Antarctic sends to FSUHD all meteorological and ice information in the Arctic seas.

SAR information is received by FSUHD from the appropriate RCC in the area. All above mentioned information is provided by FSUHD to the appropriate LES in the Safety NET for two areas described in CPRNW 2005/3/11.

The Chairman emphasized the need to coordinate with the WMO and obtain feedback as to whether or not they would support these new Arctic NAVAREAs.

IMSO reminds that we have other spectrum in HF set aside and available for communications.

IMO reminds that – COMSAR 10 will consider the document that was sent to MSC and pointed out that more submissions by countries and organizations concerned are needed.

Chairman will consult with Canada, Norway, NAVAREA XIII, and WMO as to limits and responsibilities and will include into submission for COMSAR. IMO offered their assistance with regards to the NAVTEX stations.

NAVAREA X brought up the issue of SAR in these regions which also needs to be considered.

In summation, the Chairman agreed to produce a paper for submission to the IMO. The IHO should report to Sub-Committee on Radio Communications and Search and Rescue its findings and recommendations for the extension of the WWNWS for the Arctic waters including, recommendations of the appropriate boundaries and delimitations of those areas and Member States who will act as NAVAREA Coordinators or Sub Area Coordinators. Due to time constraints and coordination efforts that are required, the submission for COMSAR 10 may be a request for extension of time to consider all matters in regards to the Arctic Extension of the WWNWS.

Inmarsat representative presented a slide with new areas proposed by the Russian Federation, service areas and service gaps and explained how existing Inmarsat C mobile terminals can be used for receiving MSI for new areas. It was also explained what software changes will be required to incorporate new areas into mobile terminals.

### **3.4.1.2 Caspian Sea**

IMSO identified that there is a major issue that is evolving with regards to large bodies of water in the world that are not deemed to be “high seas” as defined under the SOLAS convention. There has been a particular distress event in the Caspian Sea that brought attention to this issue – but it is a broader issue than that. The Caspian Sea is inside the ex USSR and Iranian waters, but today it is now surrounded by a number of independent countries and could be defined as international waters. To date, no entity has initiated the coordination for the safety of navigation or dissemination of MSI for these waters.

Inmarsat proposed to reduce existing NAV/METAREA III, as coded in the Inmarsat C mobile terminals' software, which covers both Mediterranean/Black Sea and Caspian Sea areas and define a new NAV/METAREA for Caspian Sea. The proposal was demonstrated on a separate slide. It is important to note that any changes with NAV/METAREA boundaries

will be done within Inmarsat C software and will not affect maritime boundaries as defined by IMO/IHO/WMO.

Inmarsat also noted that there is an MSI meteorological broadcast for Caspian Sea via EGC FleetNET service and it only goes to a predetermined fleet of ships that may be a single shipping company. The Chairman of the IMO NAVTEX Coordinating Panel discussed the issue of being able to broadcast MSI outside the current limits of the WNWNS. He suggested that if the CPRNW is currently defining new NAVAREA limits into the Arctic Region, then now may be the time to look at other limits also. It was also identified that there is a NAVTEX station that has been established on the Caspian Sea by the Russian Federation that is transmitting on 518 – which was included for co-ordination purposes within NAVAREA XIII. Iran has also been allocated B1 characters for a NAVTEX station transmitting on both International and National frequencies in the south of the Caspian Sea. This station has not been allocated to a NAVAREA.

The IMSO raised the question as to whether or not the ships in the Caspian Sea were being held to the SOLAS agreements for carriage requirements. This is a question that will need to be answered.

NAVAREA I Coordinator identified that NAVAREA I is the only one in the WNWNS that has a Sub-area, and suggested an alternative way forward was to include both the Black and Caspian Seas as a Sub-area of NAVAREA III. CPRNW may also want to consider that the Great Lakes as a Sub-area of NAVAREA IV.

### **3.4.2 Emerging RNW Subject Areas and Exceptional Circumstances that may affect Navigation**

#### **3.4.2.1 Tsunami Warnings**

As this matter was discussed in detail in agenda item 3.1, the Chairman identified that the Commission has asked the WMO to address concerns with regards to the issue as to whether or not a tsunami warning is a navigational warning or a meteorological warning.

#### **3.4.2.2 WHO-SARS Warnings**

The Chairman briefed on the status of discussions with WHO regarding the possible use of the WNWNS for the dissemination of Health Warnings of interest to the mariner. There was NAVAREA concern at issuing reports on disease outbreaks in another country. It would be a case of transmitting a report originated by the country concerned or by the WHO itself. It was agreed that such information was important to the mariner and that such information whilst possibly being local in nature could be of relevance to a much wider area, NAVAREA or even globally.

NAVAREA X raised concern that this matter was not currently part of the WNWNS and that such a matter would need a much wider discussion within his country.

IMO also raised the point that this had not been discussed within IMO. The discussion to date had been reported to COMSAR 9 as part of the NAVTEX Coordinating Panel report but no discussion had taken place.

The Chairman urged NAVAREA coordinators to consider this matter within the context of their NAVAREAs and provide comments to the Chairman of CPRNW as soon as possible.

The Chairman and IMSO will attempt to make new contacts with WHO as the previous contact had now retired and it remains uncertain exactly where this issue resides within WHO.

### **3.4.2.3 ISPS Security Level Warnings**

The Chairman invited the representative from NAVAREA II to present the paper COMSAR 9/12/2 titled “Proposal to amend resolution A.706 (17) on Worldwide Navigational Warning Service”. France submitted this paper at COMSAR 9 which referred it to the CPRNW without discussion.

The Chairman then opened the floor for discussion on any of these proposed amendments included in the paper. It was clarified that any amendments to A.706 have to be reviewed by the CPRNW prior to submission to COMSAR.

Discussion centered on whether such warnings were ‘NAV’ warnings and therefore correctly part of A.706 (17) or ‘other MSI’ and therefore part of A.705 (17). If they were navigational warnings then the matter of whether they should be grouped with Piracy and Armed Robbery, as proposed in the French paper, or treated as a separate matter. Further is the commission content that it should be a navigational warning or some other “Security Authority” type of message?

NAVAREA II notes that ISPS Code does not affect just ports, but also the territorial sea.

The Commission agreed that there needs to be more background in the paper as to why NAVAREA II believe that it needs to be a navigational warning and not a new type of security warning. NAVAREA II agreed to resubmit the paper to COMSAR 10 amplifying their views as to where and why this matter should be included in A.706(17). Then the matter could then be included in the wide-ranging review of all relevant documents for CPRNW to ensure a consistent and complete coverage.

### **3.4.3 Emerging Technologies**

#### **3.4.3.1 Web-based MSI**

The Chairman introduced the paper presented by Japan to COMSAR (COMSAR 9/8/1) It was agreed that NAVTEX technology was now 15 years old and that there were several emerging technologies that might provide such a service in the future. Whilst it was old it was agreed that the NAVTEX technology worked, was cheap and provided a very good service to the mariner. Further, new technologies need to be refined and develop alongside existing capabilities and there needs to be some guidance so that there is some consistency in approach.

NAVAREA X noted that the issue of MSI via the WWW and Internet. Issue with regards to the periodicity of update for the website (daily, weekly) and what validity does the website have – the mariner needs to know this for currency of data. How often is the website checked for accuracy and non-corruption, what are the risks associated with this type of website were all concerns of the Commission.

Nevertheless it was considered that CPRNW maintain a close watching brief on this matter as there will come a point in the future when a change to a new system will be necessary. There were many issues that would need addressing before any system could be accepted as meeting the requirements of GMDSS.

The new JCOMM GMDSS website (<http://weather.gmdss.org>), developed and maintained by Meteo-France, that already makes available in real-time all meteorological

MSI prepared for SafetyNET dissemination, was introduced by the WMO representative. This portal, that has already aroused very good feedbacks from mariners, is also getting great hits and trending upward and will be enriched with NAVTEX products in the future. The gmdss.org domain (booked by WMO) is available for use to make navigational warnings available on the web. Why not <http://navwarning.gmdss.org> in the future ?

It was proposed by NAVAREA X and agreed that this should be an Agenda Item in its own right at future meetings.

### **3.4.3.2 IALA ANIS**

The Chairman gave a brief outline of the proposal by IALA to develop an Aids to Navigation Information Service (ANIS) which would include short safety related messages. Cdr Sewell of the UK then outlined the outcome of the meetings which he had attended on behalf of the IHO. He said that 3 points had been made very clear to IALA, and accepted:

- The proposed system could promulgate information very quickly but only to a limited number of vessels that are so equipped to receive them.
- The warnings may be transmitted locally by the ANIS but they may not be local warnings and could have a further ranging relevance and MUST therefore be passed to the WWNWS NAVAREA Coordinators.
- The system will not cover all hazards that are relevant to the WWNWS.

It was agreed that the IHO will continue to be represented at ANIS meetings and further reports made to CPRNW.

### **3.4.3.3 SafetyNET/NAVTEX**

The IMSO representative reported that the Inmarsat 4 satellite – 1<sup>st</sup> one has been launched and on station – but is not operational as of today. The launch schedule for the next satellites is sometime next year. The key message for attendees is to remember that the Inmarsat 4 will not provide global coverage as there are only 3 satellites in this constellation and that the global coverage for maritime services will continue to have to use 3<sup>rd</sup> generation satellites.

Broadband capabilities may be opened up to the maritime community in the future. But there is no anticipated huge leap forward for maritime safety services for the foreseeable future. This will occur only with an evolution of Inmarsat-C and its technology. I4 is not targeted for maritime safety services.

NAVAREA X asked about reports of LESs being reduced to a few strategic ones around the world. It was stated that this was not currently allowed within the rules but that it might well be the case some time in the future. But reiterating that it is considered to be a long way off and that there would be much discussion beforehand.

NAVAREA I thanked Inmarsat for attending and for the information and answers that they have been able to provide. It was asked whether in view of the discussion surrounding the amendments to A.888(21) other satellite service providers might be invited in the future. The Chairman said that he would monitor the progress with A.888(21) and act accordingly.

## **3.4.4 Inmarsat EGC SafetyNET status presentation**

The Chairman invited the representative from Inmarsat to provide an in-depth presentation on the Inmarsat C EGC SafetyNET services. Key points made during the presentation included:

- In the Overview of the Inmarsat C system and services it was noted that coverage is 100% guaranteed between Latitudes 76 N and 76S – but also during certain variable times of the day, coverage can extend to 80N and 80S.
- Statistical information on MSI availability per ocean region and per type of message. The number of EGC SafetyNET messages transmitted via all ocean regions averages about 600-700 per day.
- Numerous examples of operational issues deriving from either overlap or gaps in existing NAVAREA coverage areas as coded into Inmarsat C software with proposed solutions to each identified problem area.
- Analysis and examples of the improper use of “C2” Priority, Service and Repetition Codes which can lead to delay in message reception, misleading in type of messages and repeated print out of redundant (already printed) messages.
- A proposed re-alignment of NAV/METAREAs borders in mobile terminals’ software to not extend over land areas to prevent receipt of irrelevant EGC SafetyNET messages by inland vessels and to have more space to define new areas for inland waterways.
- A proposed re-alignment of NAV/METAREAs borders in mobile terminals’ software to cover possible service gaps over ocean areas where reception of the MSI addressed to the appropriate NAV/METAREA may not be available.
- A proposed solution for Arctic areas and Caspian Sea.
- Problem with NAV/METAREA XIII due to use of improper service code C2=04 for NAVAREA, Coastal warnings and meteorological information and its implication
- New Windows MES’s SafetyNET interface, its configuration and options
- Corrections to the IMO SafetyNET Manual

The Commission noted that limits of NAVAREAs as defined in the Inmarsat C System Definition Manual do not match the established NAVAREAs. These coverage problems have been in existence since the original implementation of the WWNWS due to historical limitations when Inmarsat C software was first written. These resultant gaps and overlaps in coverage areas have the potential for improper receipt of message traffic for vessels if not covered by NAVTEX. It was also noted by the representative from Inmarsat that the NAVAREA (and METAREA) is coded into Inmarsat C mobile terminals as a two-digit number and thus there could be up to 100 different NAV/METAREAs (00-99) worldwide if the commission so desired to add additional areas.

### **3.4.5 Amendments to IMO Resolution 888 – Other Satellite Service Providers**

The Chairman invited the representative from the IMSO to provide an in-depth brief on the IMO Resolution 888. The brief was titled “IMSO - Evolving to Meet New Needs for GMDSS and LRIT”. Key points made during the brief included:

- IMSO Assembly 17 agreed to open the GMDSS to other satellite service providers, which has thus created a consequent revision of IMO Assembly Resolution A.888 and the IMSO Public Services Agreement with Inmarsat.
- The IMSO establishes technical criteria, accountability requirements, robustness of service, and other items. This is a formal agreement between IMO and IMSO who then assumes responsibility to oversee the operating contract which specifies requirements for Inmarsat to perform. Long history between IMO and Inmarsat (16 years) and not between new commercial providers who want to provide some of the services.
- The contract identifies specifically geostationary satellites and some services that are only available by Inmarsat. If other service providers are offered the opportunity to become part of GMDSS, then 888 must be made generic, as other global services do not use geostationary satellites, they use LOS or MOS. Means that GMDSS could get polar coverage – but does not give you a tracking capability and potential loss of message traffic due to switching between satellites as they rise and set. It is imperative that MSI messages can not lose any bytes of data.

It was further identified that the key issue for the Commission to consider are; what are the bottom line requirements for all aspects of satellite based maritime safety information service? Are all NAVAREAs prepared to have different service providers transmit their message traffic? At the current moment, each NAVAREA sends information to an LES and they know how it is going to be transmitted and how the transceiver shipboard terminals are going to respond. It is a symbiotic relationship between provider and customer. Important baseline requirements and issues for the Commission to consider included:

- Does the customer require automated receipt
- Does the customer require Push or Pull messages
- Does the information provider need to know how the customer terminal is going to respond to message sent (alarms, etc)
- What are resource implications for manning, satellite communication budgets, and message tracking? Manning and budgets are set to pay for resources to perform this now – do you need additional personnel because you now have to send it out 6 times per day and a way to control in-force messages.
- What are contingency planning requirements when satellite breaks down? It is known what Inmarsat can and will do – what about other service providers when one of their satellites becomes non-operational and there is a hole in coverage that circles the globe.
- Operational requirements for NAVAREA Coordinators to provide technical capability to transmit and track messages to ensure receipt. Will require additional hardware and software and possible communication capabilities to satisfy this. Multiple dissemination methods, monitoring concerns with multiple satellites in single NAVAREA (relay does not give assurance that customer received)
- Inmarsat is currently constrained in costs they can charge for MSI services – cost recoverable only. If other satellite providers are allowed to participate in

GMDSS with no intention of providing MSI services, could end up with no one wanting to do it as there will not be a cost advantage for any of them.

The IMSO identified one other option for the Commission to consider with respect to the fact that the SafetyNET server (hub) at Inmarsat HQ in London can be used to re-route MSI to alternate LESs and satellites as a backup contingency facility. It is an example of what could be done – send all your messages to one server which then automatically sends it to the right satellite provider. But there is still a monitoring issue here. Could be useful in some specific opportunity such as the Arctic areas.

The Chairman proposed that in order to expedite the process that the Commission accepts a draft from IMSO for minimum baseline requirements to maintain the current level of service and then CPRNW will review. After this review, the IHB will then forward preliminary approved requirements on to IHO member states along with respective hydrographic offices for comments. It was noted that the NAVAREA Coordinators need to seek the opinion of states in their area with regards to this issue. This will all need to be completed in a timely manner in order to provide an approved IHO CPRNW response to the IMO Correspondence Group to meet the December 6, 2005 deadline for submission to COMSAR 10.

### **3.5 Review of Guidance Documents for Currency**

As previously stated, the Chairman recognized the need to establish a correspondence group to ensure that a thorough review of all WNWWS guidance documents is conducted. His recommendation included that the IMO SafetyNET and NAVTEX Coordinating Panels lead this effort commencing after COMSAR 10, to be held in March 2006, to ensure that any changes to WNWWS Guidance Documents as a result of this conference are considered. Any recommended and proposed changes to any WNWWS guidance documentation as a result of this working group will be forwarded to all members of the CPRNW for comment prior to approval. This covers all items in agenda 3.5.

#### **3.5.1 Terms of Reference for CPRNW**

The Chairman presented his paper CPRNW 2005/3/6 titled “Change to the Terms of Reference of the Commission on Promulgation of Radio Navigational Warnings (CPRNW).

In April 2002 at the XVIth Conference, it was resolved that there should be a thorough review of the Basic Documents of the IHO and of its structure and procedures, in order to determine whether a more flexible, efficient Organization could be constructed. The Strategic Planning Work Group (SPWG) was tasked to undertake this review and to make appropriate recommendations to an Extraordinary Conference in April 2005.

Of note, the SPWG identified that the five year gap between International Hydrographic Conferences (IHC) was too long to monitor and hasten decision making and recommended the Assembly meet every three years rather than five. In conjunction, the SPWG noted the period between committee and commission meetings were also too long and suggested these meetings should be held annually.

Due to a large percentage of CPRNW’s work resulting from IMO COMSAR, SafetyNET Coordinating Panel and NAVTEX Coordinating panel meetings, and Regional Hydrographic Commissions which all meet annually, it was recommended that the



Commission meet annually rather than the biannually. In addition, under the new proposed organizational structure of the IHO, the council that will provide oversight to the CPRNW, establish goals and expectations, and provide technical guidance will meet on an annual basis.

After discussion with regards to a number of relevant points and more specifically to the need for an annual meeting not being determined by the size of the agenda or the number of papers to be presented but by the content and complexity of the issues brought forward in the papers submitted, the Commission voted and approved the change to the Terms of Reference of the CPRNW to specify that meetings would be held annually and be officially announced 9 months in advance.

Further, in consideration of annual meeting timeframes, the CPRNW takes cognizance of those States who have to travel long distances e.g. South Africa, Australia, Argentina etc. and to possibly arrange the annual meeting with other international WG meetings that take place more or less the same time as CPRNW. This may assist Member states with their travel and related budgetary concerns.

The Commission also agreed that the location of the annual meeting will be either in Monaco at the IHB or at another location if another member state would be willing to host.

**3.5.2 Implementation of the GMDSS - refer to agenda item 3.5**

**3.5.3 NAVTEX Manual 2006 Edition - refer to agenda item 3.5**

**3.5.4 International SafetyNET Manual 2003 Edition - refer to agenda item 3.5**

**3.5.5 Joint IMO/IHO/WMO Manual on MSI 2003 Edition**

The Chairman invited NAVAREA X to introduce their paper CPRNW 2005/3/02.

Following discussion the Commission agreed with:

Respect to para 2.1 it was appropriate to use NNNN as the end of message indicator but that it should appear in Table 1 at the end i.e. after the 'Postscript – cancellations' section.

Respect to para 2.3 it was agreed that this was a typographical error and should be corrected.

Respect to para 2.4 Note B it was agreed that there were both pros and cons for this and that it should therefore remain as guidance and be at the discretion of the originators.

Note G it was agreed that there were localities where additional information was needed and that this might be covered by issuing a message such as "May be unlit, reports requested."

The Chairman thanked NAVAREA X for their submission and stated the above items will be taken into account during the full review of all WWNWS documentation.

**3.5.6 Joint IMO/IHO/WMO Manual on MSI S-53 Appendix 1**

**3.5.7 IMO Resolution A.706(17)**

**3.5.8 IMO Resolution A.705(17)**

### **3.6 Meteorological Services by WMO**

The Chairman invited the representative from WMO to provide an in-depth brief on the new GMDSS website. Key points made during the presentation (see also 3.4.3.1) included:

- The gmdss.org domain is owned and available for use
- Why not a "navwarning.gmdss.org" website? Could be another potential portal to all Navarea websites.

The NAVAREA X Coordinator noting the submitted paper CPRNW 2005/3/02 titled "Review of Joint IMO/IHO/WMO Manual on MSI – 2003" requested from the WMO

representative that his organization take up the issue of providing a standard end of message indicator to their meteorological forecast messages. Customer feedback has reported confusion as to whether or not these messages are received completely.

## **4 CPRNW REPRESENTATION AT REGIONAL HYDROGRAPHIC CONFERENCES**

### **4.1 Update**

The Chairman stated the importance of MSI having high visibility at RHC Meetings and that it was important that CPRNW was represented. Neither he nor the Chairman of the NAVTEX Coordinating Panel could afford the time to attend all RHC meetings and it was therefore important that a NAVAREA Coordinator attend wherever possible. The presentations placed on the Promotional CD prepared by the Chairman would form the basis of an input with additional local information being added.

The President of the IHB stated that it was important that the outcome of CPRNW meetings be passed onto the RHCs.

The Chairman reiterated that this was an action for ALL members to be proactive in efforts to have representation of CPRNW at these conferences.

### **4.2 Development of GMDSS/MSI Briefing**

The Chairman presented a new “WWNWS CD-ROM”. This was produced in response to numerous questions from Commission members. Each person in attendance was given a copy of this CD-ROM in order to allow everyone to be working from a common platform. The Chairman requested that everyone review the content, provide updates and comments, and also provide any additional information that they would like to see included. He identified that this product would be updated on an annual or even semi-annual basis depending on changes and input received by members.

## **5 OTHER BUSINESS**

### **5.1 French Marine Investigation Branch – Sinking of RO-RO Vessel TRICOLOR**

The Chairman invited IHB – PAH to introduce paper CPRNW 2005/5/1.

The French Hydrographic Service (SHOM) had forwarded the accident report to IHB and asked CPRNW to consider sections 8.8 and 8.9. NAVAREA 1 coordinator expressed surprise and concern that he had not been consulted during the preparation of the report since they are responsible for the area of the accident.

After discussion, the Commission considered that they were not the appropriate body to conduct the study requested and invited the NAVAREA II delegate to suggest that France submit such a request to IMO as the relevant body.

### **5.2 LRIT Update**

IMSO provided a brief update of the IMO Status with regards to Long Range Identification and Tracking of vessels. The expectation is administrations would be able to

track any vessel anywhere in the world at pre-determined timeframes. Ships would be able to use communications from a wide array of systems to make their reports. Timeframe for implementation is not known yet.

IMO is meeting to identify possible draft amendments to SOLAS convention with regards to this issue.

### **5.3 NAVTEX Update in the Mediterranean Sea**

The Chairman invited the representative from NAVAREA III to introduced paper CPRNW 2005/3/18

Discussion centered on NAVTEX stations in the Mediterranean and more specifically NAVTEX service areas and the movement of NAVTEX Stations within NAVAREA III. The NAVTEX Coordinating Panel Chair stated that it is imperative that vessel knows where to get their MSI and exactly which stations to program into their NAVTEX receiver. Spain as NAVAREA III coordinator offered to organize a meeting of all affected countries in early 2006 to discuss service areas. The IHB expressed a willingness to host the meeting if requested.

Greece mentioned it has operated its NAVTEX stations since the end of 80's, with identification characters and service areas provided by the IMO Coordinating Panel, without problem. The study as the result of changing sites of the Italian stations and the new NAVTEX station from Algeria should therefore be restricted to the western Mediterranean.

The Chairman thanked NAVAREA III for his paper. And recognized that there are considerable overlaps in service areas and the difficult task they faced. The Chairman requested NAVAREA III to present findings at next CPRNW with regards to these concerns.

### **FINAL REPORT**

The Chairman stated that he would prepare a draft summary report of the meeting and provide it to the attendees for their review and comment in due course. If the comments were substantive in nature, he would provide another draft for review. If editorial, he would prepare the final summary report and provide it to all CPRNW members and Observers as a COMM.Letter.

### **NEXT MEETING**

In accordance with the approved change to the Terms of Reference with regards to the CPRNW, the next meeting will be held in one year. The preliminary dates of 12-15 September 2006 were agreed with a meeting location of IHB Monaco, unless a member state comes forward with an agreeable alternative site. Due to the large volume of material to be covered, it was agreed that this would be a 4 day meeting. A preliminary draft agenda for this meeting is included in Annex G.

### **CLOSURE OF THE MEETING**

In closing the meeting, the Chairman expressed his gratitude to all the participants, for their considerable efforts in the implementation of WWNWS and GMDSS and for their very

active and valuable contributions to the meeting. Their inputs resulted in the sharing of useful information and refinements to the system and appropriate documentation. The Chairman reiterated his comments regarding to stay in touch with "our customers," to ensure that we are fulfilling their needs and requirements. He also thanked the IHB for its excellent support during the meeting.

The 7th meeting of the CPRNW closed at 1730 on Thursday, 15 September 2005.

## ANNEX A

IHO Commission on Promulgation of Radio Navigational Warnings  
Seventh Meeting  
Agenda item 1.5

### **AGENDA FOR THE SEVENTH MEETING**

**To be held at the International Hydrographic Bureau,  
4 quai Antoine 1er, Monaco, commencing on Tuesday, 13 Sep 2005 at 0930**

#### **1 Administrative**

- .1 Introductions
- .2 Welcome by IHB
- .3 Working Arrangements
- .4 Administrative Arrangements
- .5 Adoption of the Agenda

#### **2 Matters relating to the GMDSS Master Plan (IMO)**

#### **3 Promulgation of Maritime Safety Information (MSI)**

- .1 Results from 9th Session of the International Maritime Organization's Sub-Committee on Communications and Search and Rescue
  - .1 Tsunami update
- .2 Actions arising from NAVAREA Assessments of Navigational Warnings Services by Coordinators
- .3 Coastal Warnings
  - .1 Report of the NAVTEX Co-ordinating Panel (new NAVTEX manual 2006 Ed.)
  - .2 Provision by SafetyNET
- .4 Operational Lessons Learned for consideration as improvements to the WWNWS
  - .1 MSI outside limits of WWNWS
    - .1 Arctic (Russia Federation MSC 80/13/2)
    - .2 Caspian Sea
  - .2 Emerging RNW Subject Areas and exceptional circumstances that may effect navigation
    - .1 Tsunami Warnings
    - .2 WHO – SAR Warnings
    - .3 ISPS Security Level Warnings (France COMSAR 9/12/2)
  - .3 Emerging Technologies
    - .1 Web based MSI

- .2 IALA ANIS
        - .3 SafetyNET/NAVTEX
      - .4 Inmarsat EGC SafetyNET status brief
      - .5 Amendments to IMO Resolution 888 - other Satellite Service providers
    - .5 Review of the following documents for currency, etc.
      - .1 Terms of Reference for the CPRNW (IHO Circular Letter 37/1998, 24 August 1998)
      - .2 Implementation of the GMDSS (IHO Circular Letter 31/2000, 12 July 2000)
      - .3 NAVTEX Manual 2006 Ed.
      - .4 International SafetyNET Manual 2003 Ed.
      - .5 Joint IMO/IHO/WMO Manual on MSI 2003 Ed.
      - .6 Joint IMO/IHO/WMO Manual on MSI S-53 App 1
      - .7 IMO Res. A.706(17)
      - .8 IMO Res. A.705(17)
    - .6 Meteorological Services by WMO
  - 4 CPRNW Representation at Regional Hydrographic Conferences (IHO Circular Letter 31/2000, paragraph 2.2.1)**
    - .1 Update
    - .2 Development of GMDSS/MSI Briefing
  - 5 Any Other Business**
    - .1 French Marine Investigation Branch - sinking of the RO-RO vessel TRICOLOR
  - 6 Final Report**

## ANNEX B

7<sup>th</sup> MEETING OF THE COMMISSION ON THE PROMULGATION  
OF RADIO NAVIGATIONAL WARNINGS (CPRNW)

IHB, Monaco, 13-15 September 2005

## LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Country	Name	E-mail
Argentina	<b>Cdr Valentin Sanz RODRIGUEZ</b>	<a href="mailto:snautica@hidro.gov.ar">snautica@hidro.gov.ar</a>
Australia	<b>Mr. Chris PAYNE</b>	<a href="mailto:Chris.Payne@amsa.gov.au">Chris.Payne@amsa.gov.au</a>
France	<b>Capt. Phillipe DESSARTHE</b>	<a href="mailto:philippe.dessarthe@shom.fr">philippe.dessarthe@shom.fr</a>
Greece	<b>Cdr D. POROGLOU</b>	<a href="mailto:nasf@hnhs.gr">nasf@hnhs.gr</a>
Japan	<b>Commander Koji SAITO</b>	<a href="mailto:koji-saito@kaiho.mlit.go.jp">koji-saito@kaiho.mlit.go.jp</a>
Pakistan	<b>LCdr. M Ovais BUTT</b>	<a href="mailto:hydropk@bol.edu.pk">hydropk@bol.edu.pk</a>
Republic of South Africa	<b>Mr. Malcom N. NELSON</b>	<a href="mailto:hydrosan@iafrica.com">hydrosan@iafrica.com</a>
Spain	<b>Cdr. Jose MILLAN</b>	<a href="mailto:ihmesp@retemail.es">ihmesp@retemail.es</a>
Sweden	<b>Mr. Svante HAKANSSON</b>	<a href="mailto:svante.hakansson@sjofartsverket.se">svante.hakansson@sjofartsverket.se</a>
UK	<b>LCdr. Steve GODSIFF</b> <b>Cdr. Tim SEWELL</b>	<a href="mailto:steve.godsiff@ukho.gov.uk">steve.godsiff@ukho.gov.uk</a> <a href="mailto:tim.sewell@ukho.gov.uk">tim.sewell@ukho.gov.uk</a>
USA	<b>Mr. Peter DOHERTY (CHAIRMAN)</b> <b>Mr. Keith ALEXANDER</b>	<a href="mailto:dohertyp@nga.mil">dohertyp@nga.mil</a> <a href="mailto:alexandk@nga.mil">alexandk@nga.mil</a>
IHB	<b>V Adm Alexandros MARATOS</b> <b>LtCdr. Steve SHIPMAN</b>	<a href="mailto:amaratos@ihb.mc">amaratos@ihb.mc</a> <a href="mailto:sshipman@ihb.mc">sshipman@ihb.mc</a>
IMO	<b>Mr. Vladimir LEBEDEV</b>	<a href="mailto:vlebedev@imo.org">vlebedev@imo.org</a>
IMSO	<b>Mr. Andrew FULLER</b>	<a href="mailto:andy_fuller@imso.org">andy_fuller@imso.org</a>
WMO	<b>Mr. Henri SAVINA</b>	<a href="mailto:henri.savina@meteo.fr">henri.savina@meteo.fr</a>
Russian Federation - FSUHD	<b>Mr. Alexander ZVETKOV</b> <b>Mr. Roman D. ROMEYKO-GURKO</b>	<a href="mailto:romeyko@hydrograph.spb.su">romeyko@hydrograph.spb.su</a>
INMARSAT	<b>Mr. Vladimir MAKSIMOV</b>	<a href="mailto:vladimir_maksimov@inmarsat.com">vladimir_maksimov@inmarsat.com</a>

## ANNEX E

**IHO Commission on the Promulgation of  
Radio Navigational Warnings  
International Hydrographic Bureau, Monaco  
Seventh Meeting  
Agenda Item 1**

---

**CPRNW 2005/1/2  
13 Sep 2005**

### LIST OF PAPERS

CPRNW 2005/1/1	Agenda
CPRNW 2005/1/2	List of Papers
CPRNW 2005/1/3	List of Attendees
CPRNW 2005/3/1	MSI Self Assessment – NAVAREA X Submitted by Australia
CPRNW 2005/3/2	Review of the Joint IMO/IHO/WMO Manual on MSI – 2003 Edition Submitted by Australia
CPRNW 2005/3/3	MSI Self Assessment – NAVAREA VII Submitted by South Africa
CPRNW 2005/3/4	MSI Self Assessment – NAVAREA IV and XII Submitted by United States
CPRNW 2005/3/5	Extension of the WorldWide Navigational Warning Service to the Arctic Waters Submitted by Chairman
CPRNW 2005/3/6	Change to the Terms of Reference of The Commission on Promulgation of Radio Navigational Warnings (CPRNW). Submitted by Chairman
CPRNW 2005/3/7	MSI Self Assessment – NAVAREA XIII Submitted by Russia
CPRNW 2005/3/8	MSI Self Assessment – NAVAREA I Submitted by United Kingdom
CPRNW 2005/3/09	Report of the NAVTEX Co-ordinating Panel Submitted by Chairman, IMO NAVTEX Co-ordinating Panel
CPRNW 2005/3/10	Maritime Weather Services – METAREA X Submitted by Australia
CPRNW 2005/3/11	Establishment of Two New NAVAREA's in Arctic Seas



Submitted by Russian Federation

CPRNW 2005/3/12

MSI SELF ASSESSMENT - BALTICO  
Submitted by the Sweden

CPRNW 2005/3/13

Tsunami Warning Broadcast  
Submitted by Australia

CPRNW 2005/3/14

MSI SELF ASSESSMENT - NAVAREA XI  
Submitted by Japan

CPRNW 2005/3/15

MSI SELF ASSESSMENT - NAVAREA VI  
Submitted by Argentina

CPRNW 2005/3/16

MSI SELF ASSESSMENT - NAVAREA XVI  
Submitted by Peru

CPRNW 2005/3/17

MSI SELF ASSESSMENT - NAVAREA III  
Submitted by Spain

CPRNW 2005/3/18

NAVTEX SERVICE AREAS –NAVAREA III  
Submitted by Spain

CPRNW 2005/3/19

MSI SELF ASSESSMENT - NAVAREA IX  
Submitted by Pakistan

CPRNW 2005/5/1

BEAMER Report into the sinking of the TRICOLOR  
Submitted by IHB

## ANNEX F

LIST OF ACTION ITEMS  
(Status as of 15 Sep 2005)

Agenda Item	Subject	Status	Comments	Action By
3.4.1.1	CPRNW Paper to COMSAR 10 identifying Arctic Expansion of NAVAREAs		COMSAR 10 may be too aggressive considering deadline of Dec 6, 2005. Inmarsat will assist in identifying Service Areas.	Chairman
3.2	Chairman to provide a Self-Assessment template		Members to provide input and have a 2 <sup>nd</sup> review prior to approval	Chairman
4.2	Feedback and input on the "WWNWS CD-ROM"		Please provide feedback by Nov 1 2005. Next Edition will be printed in Jan 2006	All Members
3.1	IMO to demonstrate Inmarsat capabilities. Inmarsat to assist.		Idea is to present Inmarsat Capabilities to a WMO/IOC audience – IMO COMSAR recognized as a preferred venue	IMO / Inmarsat / IHO
5	Chairman request each member provide an estimated travel cost to attend CPRNW meeting		Only travel, lodging and food. Not necessary to add salary. Provide by Oct 7 2005.	All Members
3.2	Customer hits against web-based NAVAREA warnings. Each NAVAREA that has web-based MSI to capture.		This will be added to the self assessment template	All Members
4.2	IMSO to draft text for contingency planning for inclusion into the Chairman's "WWNWS Presentation CD-ROM".		Business continuity plans	IMSO
3.3.1	NAVTEX Coordinating Panel report on dual language transmission of WWNWS messages		English only? For 2006 CPRNW Meeting	Chairman IMO NAVTEX Panel
3.5	SafetyNET and NAVTEX Coordinating Panel will create correspondence group to review all guidance documents. First meeting will convene after COMSAR 10.		NAVAREA I to confirm dates/location and provide feedback back to Chairman ASAP.	SafetyNET and NAVTEX Coordinating Panel

	NAVAREA I asked to host			
3.4.4	Inmarsat to provide clarification on reception of EGC SafetyNET Coastal Warnings related to NAV/METAREA set up as a secondary area and other operational issues raised at the meeting.		Clarification on messages being received by two NAVAREAs and the ability to receive	Inmarsat
3.4.4	Inmarsat to provide a separate paper on the EGC SafetyNET status and presentation at the next meeting			Inmarsat
3.5	Inmarsat to provide the Chairman with draft changes to IMO SafetyNET Manual		As part of the review of all MSI documentation.	Inmarsat
3.4.4	Inmarsat to provide IMSO (IHO/WMO) with proposed boundaries of existing NAV/METAREAs for approval and software changes			Inmarsat
3.4.4	Inmarsat to provide analysis on MSI traffic volume loading in IOR and POR and advise if there is a need to shift some EGC SafetyNET traffic to off-peak hours to avoid delays in MSI delivery			Inmarsat
3.4.2.2	NAVAREA opinion and concerns on promulgation of WHO messages		Input required by all Members Feb 1 2006	All Members
3.4.2.2	IMSO representative to contact the WHO concerning Health Advisories		Who is the WHO contact replacement for Sandy Cocksridge?	IMSO
3.4.2	The IMSO raised question to IMO as to whether or not the ships in the Caspian Sea were being held to the SOLAS agreements for carriage requirements		Need IMO opinion	IMO
3.4.5	Invite for satellite service providers to present at		Referring to IMO RES 888	Chairman and IMSO

	CPRNW.			
5	NAVAREA III to present findings at next CPRNW with regards to NAVTEX stations in the Mediterranean		Service Area and station relocation concerns.	NAVAREA III

## ANNEX G

### **PROVISIONAL AGENDA FOR THE EIGHTH MEETING**

**To be held at xxx, commencing on Tuesday, 12 Sep 2006 at 0930**

#### **1 Administrative**

- .1 Introductions
- .2 Welcome by IHB
- .3 Working Arrangements
- .4 Administrative Arrangements
- .5 Review and Approval of 2005 CPRNW Meeting Minutes
  - .1 Update on Action Items
- .6 Adoption of the Agenda

#### **2 Matters relating to the GMDSS Master Plan (IMO)**

#### **3 Promulgation of Maritime Safety Information (MSI)**

- .1 Results from 10th Session of the International Maritime Organization's Sub-Committee on Communications and Search and Rescue
- .2 Actions arising from NAVAREA Assessments of Navigational Warnings Services by Coordinators
- .3 Coastal Warnings
  - .1 Report of the NAVTEX Co-ordinating Panel
  - .2 Provision by SafetyNET
- .4 Operational Lessons Learned for consideration as improvements to the WWNWS
  - .1 MSI outside limits of WWNWS
    - .1 Arctic Expansion

#### **4 Emerging RNW/MSI Subject Areas and Technologies**

- .1 Emerging RNW Subject Areas and exceptional circumstances that may effect navigation
  - .1 Tsunami Warnings
  - .2 WHO – SARS Warnings
  - .3 ISPS Security Level Warnings
- .2 Emerging MSI Technologies
  - .1 Web based MSI

- .2 SafetyNET/NAVTEX
- .4 Inmarsat EGC SafetyNET status brief
- .5 Other Service Providers status brief
- .6 Update from Amendments to IMO Resolution 888

## **5 WWNWS Document Review**

- .1 Review of the following documents for currency, etc.
  - .1 Terms of Reference for the CPRNW (IHO Circular Letter 37/1998, 24 August 1998)
  - .2 Implementation of the GMDSS (IHO Circular Letter 31/2000, 12 July 2000)
  - .3 NAVTEX Manual 2006 Ed.
  - .4 International SafetyNET Manual 2003 Ed.
  - .5 Joint IMO/IHO/WMO Manual on MSI 2003 Ed.
  - .6 Joint IMO/IHO/WMO Manual on MSI S-53 App 1
  - .7 IMO Res. A.706(17)
  - .8 IMO Res. A.705(17)

## **6 CPRNW Representation at Regional Hydrographic Conferences (IHO Circular Letter 31/2000, paragraph 2.2.1)**

- .1 Update
- .2 Update to Chairman's WWNWS CD-ROM

## **7 Any Other Business**

- .1 Meteorological Services by WMO
- .2 NAVAREA III Report on NAVTEX Service Area's

## **8 Final Report**