

**List of outstanding items:**

<b>Para</b>	<b>Outstanding</b>	<b>Resolved</b>
<b>Preface Para 3</b> <b>4<sup>th</sup> line:</b>	By IHO “...revisions to IMO, as amended resolutions...” – I think that the “as amended” can be deleted here. This is just a general reference to the resolutions.	<b>Editorial DONE</b>
<b>Preface Para 5</b> <b>4<sup>th</sup> line:</b>	By IHO “..March 2010 and subsequently approved...” – I think the word “subsequently” can be deleted as it does not add anything to the text.	<b>Editorial DONE</b>
<b>Gen info</b> <b>First line</b>	<b>Sweden</b> <b>Replace</b> navigational and meteorological warnings and urgent information with <b>maritime safety information</b>	<b>Editorial DONE</b>
<b>Gen info</b> <b>Last line</b>	By France S 53 is the free copy (copy or another word ?) of the Joint MSI manuel, so I propose : “It should be used in conjunction with the Joint IMO/IHO/WMO Manual on Maritime Safety Information or its copy, the IHO/IMO World-Wide Navigational Warning Service Guidance Document, IHO Publication S-53.”  By IHO: I do not think we want to say "or its copy, the IHO...". They are two equivalent publications one issued by IMO and one by IHO, so I think the text without the reference to the Appendix is OK.	<b>Resolved by IHO</b>
<b>2.1.1</b>	<b>Sweden</b> <b>Replace</b> navigational and meteorological warnings and urgent information with maritime safety information	<b>Editorial DONE</b>
<b>2.1.4</b>	By IHO The IHB would also like to propose that the following text be included in paragraph 2.1.4. “The	<b>Agreed - DONE</b>

	co-ordination function of the IMO Navtex Co-ordinating Panel with respect to National NAVTEX broadcasts on 490 kHz and 4209.5 kHz is limited to the allocation of B <sub>1</sub> characters.” This could go immediately before the statement: “Terms of Reference....”.	
<b>2.1.5</b>	By IHO The GMDSS Master Plan is now issued as GMDSS/Circ.12. I suggest that we future proof this by simply saying “...published by IMO in its series of GMDSS Circulars.”	<b>Editorial DONE</b>
<b>2.1.5 last line:</b>	By France we could say : " ... and in the GMDSS Master Plan published by IMO (the most recent circular of the series of GMDSS.1/Circ.)"  By IHO I still think it better not to mention the GMDSS Circular number as IMO have been issuing these annually of late and our text would almost immediately be out of date.	<b>Editorial (covered by row above) DONE</b>
<b>2.1.5</b>	<b>Sweden</b> Suggested correction to the diagram Replace “Select geographical coverage area” by “Select NAVTEX Service Area”	<b>By the secretary:</b> I like the thinking behind this BUT – there are not many service areas actually defined, and in addition, this diagram is not specifically for the International NAVTEX Service (National Services don’t need Service Areas. Suggest this is changed from “ <b>Select</b> geographical coverage area” to “ <b>Select</b> transmitter identification character”
<b>2.2.1.5</b>	<b>Sweden</b> All valid coastal warnings need to be included in the “in force bulletin”, as NAVTEX is the means	<b>By the secretary:</b> In practice, I expect that everyone

	<p>for dissemination of coastal warnings to international shipping (it does not help foreign ships much if a coastal state has included coastal warnings in the national NtM).</p> <p><b>Original text:</b>  <i>In-force bulletin</i> means a list of serial numbers of those NAVAREA, Sub-Area or coastal warnings in force issued and broadcast by the NAVAREA co-ordinator, Sub-Area co-ordinator or National co-ordinator during at least the previous six weeks.</p>	<p>includes all warnings in force in their lists anyway – not just the last six weeks. The term “<i>at least</i> six weeks” allows for this.</p> <p><b>Discuss</b></p>
<p><b>2.2.1.6 General</b></p>	<p>By IHO  Frequencies:</p> <p>2.2.1 In definition 6 we have International NAVTEX on 518 and 4209.5 and in definition 15 we have National NAVTEX on frequencies other than 518 and 4209.5.</p> <p>But then in 3.1.1 under 4209.5 kHz we have “Type of Service: International or National” and under content and Languages there are references to both International and National Services. Also the title of 4.2 says National NAVTEX Services on 490 kHz or 4209.5 kHz.</p> <p>By IHO  In definitions 6 “International NAVTEX Service” and 15 “National NAVTEX Service” we have added “4209.5 kHz” however in A.705, A.706, and the MSI and SafetyNET Manuals we only refer to 518 kHz. Is this something we need to store for future reference when we start over again?</p>	<p><b>To be resolved</b></p>
<p><b>2.2.1.12</b></p>	<p><b>Sweden</b>  <i>METAREA issuing service</i> means the National Meteorological Service which has accepted responsibility for ensuring that meteorological forecasts and warnings, <b>for the whole of or a part of the METAREA</b>, are disseminated through the International NAVTEX service.</p>	<p><b>By the secretary:</b>  These words reflect the SafetyNET Manual, but there may be a case for this definition to be generic to both SafetyNET and NAVTEX manuals?  ie:  <i>METAREA issuing service</i> means</p>

		the National Meteorological Service which has accepted responsibility for the dissemination of meteorological forecasts and warnings, for the whole, or a part, of the METAREA. <b>Discuss</b>
<b>2.2.1.21</b>	<b>Sweden</b> NAVTEX means the system for the broadcast and automatic reception of maritime safety information in text format by means of <b>the system described in Annex 2 (ITU-R M.540).</b>	<b>DONE</b>
<b>2.2.1.29 to 32</b>	By Secretary Document review meeting could not decide whether to leave these definitions in the NAVTEX Manual or take them out	<b>To be resolved</b>
<b>2.2.1.38</b>	<b>Sweden</b> Replace “centralized” with: conducted by the IMO International NAVTEX Co-ordinating panel	<b>By secretary:</b> I think we should try to keep this definition generic throughout all our reference documents. <b>Discuss</b>
<b>2.2.3</b>	<b>Sweden</b> Delete “Mediterranean” under NAVAREA III	<b>Spain asked to provide new graphic</b>
<b>3.1.1 line immediately above “518 kHz”:</b>	By IHO Delete “to” so as to read “The following frequencies may be used for NAVTEX broadcasts:”	<b>Editorial DONE</b>
<b>3.1.1</b>	<b>Sweden</b> 518 – Content: replace Information for SOLAS vessels only, with MSI for coastal waters	<b>discuss</b>

	<p><b>Sweden</b> 4209.5 – Content: When used as International Service - replace <b>Information for SOLAS vessels only</b>, with <b>MSI</b> for coastal waters When used as National Service - replace <b>any information</b>, with <b>MSI</b> selected by the National Administration</p>	discuss
	<p><b>Sweden</b> 490 – Content replace <b>Any information</b>, with <b>MSI</b> selected by the National Administration</p>	discuss
<b>3.1.3</b>	<p><b>Sweden</b> See the wording in MSC 148(77) 4.1 – delete <b>In the case of dual receivers</b>,</p>	<b>DONE</b>
<b>3.2</b>	<p><b>Sweden</b> Replace narrow-band direct-printing with NAVTEX</p>	<p><b>Deleted</b> narrow-band direct-printing – not necessary to replace by NAVTEX <b>DONE</b></p>
<b>4</b>	<p><b>Greece</b> (1) A new paragraph 4.6 should be added, to clarify that, the usage of frequencies 518 KHZ , 490 KHZ and 4209.5 KHZ, either for national or international use of NAVTEX Service, should be applied to the already existing and defined Service Areas. It is estimated that an opposite application/adjustment might have resulted in a possible consequence providing a B1 character to the interested state by the IMO NAVTEX Coordinating panel for the application of a National NAVTEX Service, without the prerequisite of the agreement of the neighboring states about the limits of the Service Area (something that doesn't stand for the international NAVTEX Service in the frequency 518 KHZ), which will cause confusion to the mariners. Additionally, a new agreement of the neighboring states for defining new Service Areas will not be required, as a result the defining of a B1 character to the interested factor would take place immediately (2) a new paragraph marked 4.7 should be added, just as in the corresponding IMO NAVTEX Manual, published in 2005, with the same text: "Each station... in the region".</p>	<p><b>(1) - Linked to changes to nature of 4209.5</b></p> <p><b>(2) – Reinserting the old paragraph 3.1.4 from the old NAVTEX Manual is not</b></p>

		<p>necessary because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. This is not pertinent to this section about “planning” a service, and;</li> <li>b. The new definition at 2.2.1.23 now contains all the old text from the original 3.1.4.</li> </ol>
<p><b>4.1.3</b></p>	<p><b>Sweden</b> Delete “logically” . Replace “established” with “appropriate”</p>	<p><b>By secretary:</b> “logically” could be replaced by “likely” – as we are talking about the “planning” stage here.</p> <p>In respect to replacing “established” with “appropriate” in the last sentence – this sentence could actually be deleted all together as it serves no real purpose anymore.</p> <p><b>Discuss</b></p>
<p><b>4.1.5</b></p>	<p><b>Sweden</b> Last sentence re-worded: national authorities seeking to establish NAVTEX services shall undertake preliminary discussions with the NAVAREA Co-ordinator, METAREA Issuing Services and neighbouring authorities prior to formal application to IMO through the IMO NAVTEX Co-ordinating Panel. <b>These discussions shall consider the most appropriate NAVTEX service area boundaries, possible geographical locations for transmitter sites to ensure optimal coverage, and links with information providers.</b> Original text:</p>	<p><b>Editorial DONE</b></p>

	national authorities seeking to establish NAVTEX services shall undertake preliminary discussions with the NAVAREA Co-ordinator, METAREA Issuing Services and neighbouring authorities prior to formal application to IMO through the IMO NAVTEX Co-ordinating Panel. These discussions shall consider the possible geographical locations for sites to ensure optimal coverage, NAVTEX service area boundaries and links with information providers	
<b>4.1.6</b>	<b>Sweden</b> Change night-time, to night conditions	<b>Agreed - DONE</b>
<b>5.1.1</b>	Canada Table needs title	<b>Editorial DONE</b>
<b>5.1.1</b>	By IHO Tables We have Tables 1 and 2 on pages 18 and 26 respectively, however the “ B Characters” on Page 16 is not so labelled..	<b>Editorial DONE</b>
<b>4.5</b>	<b>Sweden</b> Replace “Transmitter ID character” by “Service Area ID Character”	<b>Linked to previous suggestion at 2.1.5</b>
<b>5.1.1</b>	<b>Sweden</b> Replace Transmitter Identification Character with Service Area Identification Character Repeat for column one heading	<b>Linked to previous suggestion at 2.1.5</b>
	<b>Sweden</b> Table Use of specific B2 character G for AIS? AIS as an aid to navigation should be regarded as Navigational Warnings (B <sub>2</sub> =A).  Use of specific B2 character J for SATNAV Messages All ships are nowadays navigating by means of SATNAV. Errors to SATNAV could be major threats to the safety at sea and should not be possible to reject. For these reasons SATNAV messages should be regarded as Navigational Warnings (B <sub>2</sub> =A).	<b>Discuss</b>

	Use of specific B2 character K for <b>Other electronic navigational aid system messages</b> Messages about errors to Navigational Aids should be regarded as Navigational Warnings (B <sub>2</sub> =A).	
<b>5.2</b>	<b>Sweden</b> Replace Transmitter Identification Character with Service Area Identification Character	<b>Linked to previous suggestion at 2.1.5</b>
<b>5.2.1</b>	<b>Sweden</b> See above	<b>Linked to previous suggestion at 2.1.5</b>
<b>5.2.2</b>	<b>Sweden</b> Replace “a random” with “such a”	<b>Changed to:</b> “hence, consecutive B1 characters are not normally allocated to adjacent stations.” <b>DONE</b>
<b>5.2.2</b> <b>Last sentence:</b>	By IHO I find this sentence very difficult to read and understand. I suggest the following text: “Experience has shown that this removes the risk of a station which over-runs its time slot masking the phasing signal of an adjacent station which is about to begin its transmission.”	<b>Editorial DONE</b>
<b>5.2.7</b>	Canada There may be a tendency to assume this verbatim, irrespective of procedures outlined in paragraph 11.2.1.	<b>By secretary</b> Suggest that this whole paragraph is deleted. <b>Discuss</b>
<b>5.2.7</b>	Canada Gale warnings are not identified as “VITAL” in 11.1.4 Replace with either tsunami or piracy, which are “extreme urgency” messages.	<b>By secretary</b> Suggest that this whole paragraph is deleted. <b>Discuss</b>
<b>5.2.7</b>	<b>Sweden</b> Replace In order to increase the effectiveness of the system, the frequency shall remain unused for a high percentage of the time, so as to allow for the immediate broadcast of vital information, e.g. search and rescue information, gale warnings, etc.	<b>By secretary</b> Suggest that this whole paragraph is deleted. <b>Discuss</b>



	<p>With To allow for the immediate broadcast of vital information, e.g. search and rescue information, gale warnings, etc. the frequency must not be occupied by the scheduled routine broadcasts for a too high percentage of time</p>	
<b>5.3.2</b>	<p><b>Sweden</b> Same suggestions as 5.1.1 above</p>	<b>Table deleted as it was just a duplication of Table 1.</b>
<b>5.3.2</b>	<p>By IHO In the table there is a footnote, 10, to the text with letter “L” in the table. This footnote also needs to be linked to the text of Para 5.3.4. Suggest that we either add a superscript 10 after the “L” in line 1 or add a note in brackets after “L” saying (See Footnote 10).  Also the information included might reasonably be classed as Tables</p>	<b>Table deleted as it was just a duplication of Table 1.</b>
<b>5.4.3 last line</b>	<p>By IHO Instead of “at the NAVTEX receiver” I suggest that we say “set on (or set in) the NAVTEX receiver.</p>	<b>Editorial DONE Changed to “selected on”</b>
<b>7.1</b>	<p><b>Sweden</b> Figure 6 The word “carriage return” is a remnant from the first generation of Telex and if it shall be used we need to explain it. “Carriage return + line feed” suggested to be replaced by the word “ENTER”</p>	<b>Difficult one because NAVTEX is <i>still</i> “first generation of Telex” – discuss.</b>
<b>7.3.1</b>	<p><b>Sweden</b> Table 3 It need to be explained that the necessary ZCZC, spaces, NNNN and line feeds are automatically inserted by modern NAVTEX transmitting equipment. If extra NNNN are inserted manually it could result in unwanted interruption of the transmission.</p>	<b>Discuss</b>
<b>7.3.1</b>	<p>Also the information included might reasonably be classed as Tables</p>	<b>Table number added</b>
<b>7.3.3</b>	<p>Canada Given the concern over broadcasts exceeding allotted timeframes, shouldn’t examples reflect the use of internationally recognized abbreviations?</p>	<b>examples changed!</b>

8.3	<p><b>Sweden</b> Delete allow the broadcast and automatic reception of maritime safety information by means of narrow-band direct-printing telegraphy and replace with “use”</p>	<b>Editorial DONE</b>
9.1.2	<p><b>Sweden</b> Delete The cancelled message shall not be transmitted on the broadcast in which its cancellation message appears or in any subsequent transmissions.</p>	<p><b>By secretary:</b> This is a relevant statement due to the frequency of broadcasts every 4 hours – whereby a message could be due to go out in the next time slot but has been cancelled by a subsequent message which will appear first because its message ID puts it at the top of the list. That said, the last 5 words “or in any subsequent transmissions.” Could be deleted. <b>Discuss</b></p>
10.2 line 5	<p>By IHO Suggest “engaged in coastal passages” be changed to “engaged on coastal passages” or just “vessels on coastal passage”</p>	<p><b>Editorial:</b> <b>Changed to “vessels on coastal passages”</b> <b>DONE</b></p>
10.2.1.1 lines 5 and 7	<p>By IHO At the end of line 5 “...if they are readily available...” This is not in line with 10.2 but I understand what is intended and suggest it be changed to “...if they become readily available...”  Middle of line 7 “...period of 6 weeks they may no longer be...” suggest this is changed to “...period of 6 weeks they need no longer be...”</p>	<p><b>By secretary:</b> Not quite sure where the conflict with 10.2 occurs? Current text agrees with A.706 4.1.2 and S-53 4.1.5 We could change 10.2.1.1 but would need to change all the other</p>

		documents as well. <b>Discuss</b>
<b>10.2.1.3</b>	By IHO The definition (No 8) for Local Warning is consistent with A.706 and the MSI and SafetyNET Manuals however in section 10.2.1.3 we have the old wording of inshore of the fairway buoy etc. Suggest that 10.2.1.3 be changed to "...information relating to inshore waters, often within the limits of jurisdiction of a harbour or port authority, as defined in IMO Assembly resolution A.706 (17), as amended."	<b>Agree</b> <b>DONE</b>
<b>10.2.2.1</b>	Canada Typically gale, storm and hurricane force wind warnings are forecast well in advance of the event and are common occurrence during the winter storm season.  Canada The use of the "extreme urgency" status attributed to a "VITAL" message priority for these meteorological events seems excessive when an "IMPORTANT" priority would be sufficient. Under 11.1.4, a gale warning is not considered VITAL This statement is not entirely accurate given the procedure in 11.2.2.	<b>Canada to elaborate</b>  <b>Discuss</b>
<b>10.2.2</b>	<b>Sweden</b> Re-word first sentence meteorological warnings (B <sub>2</sub> = B) e.g. gale warnings, which are raised by nominated Meteorological authorities, shall be placed on the broadcast immediately on receipt by the NAVTEX Co-ordinator and repeated <del>at the next routine scheduled transmission only</del> at subsequent scheduled transmissions for as long as the gale warning is in force. These messages shall contain <b>only</b> the appropriate warnings and shall be separate from the weather forecasts;	<b>Discuss</b>
<b>10.2.2.2</b>	<b>Sweden</b> Delete second sentence weather forecasts (B <sub>2</sub> = E) shall be broadcast at least twice each day. This service shall be	<b>Discuss</b>

	carefully co-ordinated where transmitters are geographically close together. <del>It is important that such forecasts only appertain to the appropriate NAVTEX service area for each transmitter;</del> Comment: The weather forecast shall appertain to the appropriate NAVTEX Service Area and adjoining areas which may be reached by an ordinary ship within 12 h.	
<b>10.2.2.4</b>	<b>Sweden</b> Re-worded ice accretion warnings (icing warnings) shall normally be included in gale warning but if no gale is expected they are to be treated as a meteorological warning using $B_2 = B$ and transmitted immediately on receipt and at the next routine scheduled transmission. Comment: Ice reports are issued for ice-covered waters. If the water is covered by ice there is no risk of ice accretion on ships.	<b>Discuss</b>
<b>10.2.3.1</b>	Canada In 11.1.4, SAR information is “VITAL”, but it’s not stipulated here.	<b>Discuss</b>
<b>10.2.3.2</b>	Canada Broadcast immediately on receipt (after initial RT broadcast).  Perhaps add the clarifier, “subject to avoiding interference to ongoing transmissions”?	<b>Discuss</b>
<b>10.2.4</b>	Canada Though “VITAL” this is not entirely accurate given the procedure in 11.2.1.  Perhaps add the clarifier, “subject to avoiding interference to ongoing transmissions”?	<b>Discuss</b>
<b>10.2.5</b>	Canada Though “VITAL” this is not entirely accurate given the procedure in 11.2.1.  Perhaps add the clarifier, “subject to avoiding interference to ongoing transmissions”?	<b>Discuss</b>
<b>10.2.6</b>	By IHO	<b>Agreed - Editorial</b>

<b>start of line 3</b>	“...stress of weather...” suggest this is changed to “...bad weather...”	Paragraph re-written, with reference to weather deleted <b>DONE</b>
<b>10.2.7.3</b>	By Secretary recommended down time leading to a message has still to be agreed for AIS	<b>To be resolved</b>
<b>10.2.7.4</b>	<b>Sweden</b> Comment: Failures to electronic navaid are of vital importance to ships and should not be possible to reject. Such failures must be treated as a Navigational Warning	<b>This comment relates to an earlier suggestion – not here</b>
<b>10.2.9.</b>	<b>Sweden</b> Table 3 The list of abbreviations should not only deal with “meteo abbreviations” but should also include abbreviations needed in Navigational Warnings.	<b>Sweden have been asked to suggest a list of abbreviations for this manual.</b>
<b>11.1.1.1</b>	Canada <b>.1 VITAL</b> - for immediate broadcast subject to avoiding interference to ongoing transmissions <b>see page 36: Annex 1, paragraph 6.1</b>	<b>This comment relates to an earlier suggestion</b>
<b>11.2 and 11.2.1</b>	By IHO There is a numbering issue here. Para11.2 has 3 sub paras .1; .2; and .3 therefore we have two paras 11.2.1. Suggest the final para in section 11.2 be renumbered 11.3	<b>Editorial DONE</b>
<b>11.2</b>	<b>By Turkey</b> I have a look at the Draft Revised NAVTEX Manual (WWNWS2/4/5A) and I suggest to indicate the message contents in the sub paragraphs “.2 IMPORTANT messages” and “.3 ROUTINE messages” of the paragraph “11.2 Broadcast procedures” On the other hand, SAR relevant messages are identified to be sent as VITAL and the ones with Code D are being sent as VITAL progressively. However, the message types stated in “Section 5.3.2” is not specified as to be IMPORTANT or ROUTINE. Our recommendations for the prevention of confusion are to make use of the message types A,B and L as IMPORTANT and the rest of the message types as ROUTINE	<b>Discuss, however; the use of B2 characters should not be linked with the priority of the message.</b>

<p><b>11.2.1</b></p>	<p><b>Sweden</b>  Reworded:  On receipt of a message with a <b>VITAL</b> priority, the NAVTEX Co-ordinator will commence monitoring the NAVTEX frequency. If the frequency is clear, the VITAL message is to be transmitted immediately. If the frequency is in use, the Co-ordinator shall contact the station which, according to the schedule, will be transmitting during the following time slot and ask it to postpone the transmission start by one minute. Once the <b>VITAL</b> message has been transmitted, the scheduled station is free to start its scheduled transmissions;  Comment:  This routine has never worked in real life. The text need to be redrafted as suggested  Original:  On receipt of a message with a <b>VITAL</b> priority, the NAVTEX Co-ordinator will commence monitoring the NAVTEX frequency. If the frequency is clear, the VITAL message is to be transmitted immediately. If the frequency is in use, the Co-ordinator is to determine which other station is transmitting, and contact that station by any other means at his disposal with a request that they break their transmission to allow the sending of the <b>VITAL</b> message. As soon as the frequency is clear, the <b>VITAL</b> message is to be transmitted. Once the <b>VITAL</b> message has been transmitted, the former station is free to resume scheduled transmissions;</p>	<p><b>Agreed and DONE but should be discussed.</b></p>
<p><b>11.2.3 last line.</b></p>	<p>By IHO  “...use of a higher priority.” Suggest that we change this to: “...use of ‘IMPORTANT’ or ‘VITAL’.”</p>	<p><b>Agree DONE</b></p>
<p><b>12.1</b></p>	<p><b>Sweden</b>  Original paragraph:  NAVTEX Co-ordinators exercise control of messages transmitted by each station according to the information contained in each message and the geographical coverage required. Thus a user may choose to accept messages, as appropriate, either from the single transmitter which serves the sea area around his position or from a number of transmitters. Ideally, the user should select the station within whose coverage area his vessel is currently operating and the station into whose</p>	<p><b>By the secretary:</b>  The original first sentence has be re-written and added to:  The NAVTEX Co-ordinator is responsible for the messages transmitted by each station under his control. This responsibility</p>

	<p>coverage area his vessel will transit next.</p> <p>Comment: This sentence could be difficult to understand for people with native language other than English.</p>	<p>includes checking that the content of each message is in accordance with the Joint IMO/IHO/WMO Manual on Maritime Safety Information and also, that it is relevant to the NAVTEX Service Area of the transmitting station.</p> <p><b>DONE</b></p>
<b>12.2</b>	<p><b>By Secretary</b> <b>This list is still very much open for debate and may be added to</b></p>	<p><b>No new items have been received for this section</b></p>
<b>12.3.3</b>	<p><b>Sweden</b> NAVTEX is the means for promulgating MSI to coastal waters, regardless of the requirements are national or international.</p>	<p><b>Discuss</b></p>
<b>12.3.3 last line</b>	<p>By IHO “(see Annex 5 – COMSAR/Circ.28).” It is actually Paragraph 5 of the single Annex to the COMSAR Circular. I think that it would also be useful to include the title for clarity and therefore suggest that this is replaced by: “See paragraph 5 of the Annex to COMSAR/Circ.28 on the International NAVTEX Service.”</p>	<p><b>Editorial DONE</b> <b>Section re-formatted for clarity</b></p>
<b>12.4</b>	<p><b>Greece</b> In reference to Chapter 12 " Responsibilities of a NAVTEX Coordinator", it is suggested that in paragraph 12.4 the term " coastal navigational warnings" should be replaced with the term " coastal warnings", according to its official definition in par. 2.2.1.1</p>	<p><b>Editorial DONE</b></p>
<b>14</b>	<p><b>By the secretary</b> <b>This section has been re-written and now incorporates the text of the original Circ 28 which has now been removed and should be revoked?</b></p>	<p><b>Action for IHB to revoke Circ 28</b></p>
<b>14.1.1 2<sup>nd</sup> line</b>	<p>By IHO We have “Maritime Safety Information” written in full. Suggest that this is abbreviated to MSI as in the rest of the text.</p>	<p><b>By Secretary</b> <b>Original drafts of 705 and 706 contained “MSI” throughout, but IMO insisted that we write</b></p>

	I have just done a search on “Maritime Safety Information” throughout the document and found some varied use. I think there needs to be some standardisation. Where it is there as a part of a publication title and also as a definition then it should be in full, possibly also in the Preface. Its first use in Chapter 1 Para 1 3 <sup>rd</sup> line it should have (MSI) added and thereafter just use MSI.	<b>“maritime safety information” in full everywhere (not even capitalised). I have changed all to maritime safety information in full.</b>
<b>14.2</b>	<b>Greece</b> In reference to chapter 14 " Mutual Interference between NAVTEX Stations", it is suggested that in paragraph 14.2 the sentence : " Occasionally ..... their services" should be deleted. The deletion is suggested, because it is not consistent with the philosophy of the system based on the strict keeping of the 10 minute broadcast	<b>Agreed DONE</b>
<b>Terms of reference</b>	By IHO Terms of reference membership of the NAVTEX Co-ordinating Panel versus that of the International SafetyNET Panel	<b>Discuss</b>
<b>Terms of reference</b>	<b>Greece</b> In paragraph 3.2 in the end of the line "These meetings are usually scheduled to be held .... are in attendance" to be added "and their convening should receive the necessary prior publicity so that all Member States concerned be able to attend"	<b>Discuss</b>
<b>Annex 2</b>	By IHO In Annex 2 “Recommendation ITU-R M.540” (c) second bullet there is only reference to 518 kHz. Is this something we can change?	<b>Will be mopped up by earlier comments</b>
<b>ANNEX 2</b>	By IHO We have the ever present problem here of Annexes to Annexes! Annex 2 which the ITU-R M.540 itself contains two annexes so I suggest that for these two Annexes we say “Annex I to Recommendation ITU-R M.540” and “Annex II to Recommendation ITU-R M.540” in order that these are part of Annex 2 and not separate Annexes to the Manual.	<b>Discuss</b>
<b>ANNEX 2 Annex II</b>	By the Secretary ITU Res is incorrect as (A-Z) instead of (A-X)	<b>IMO happy with this</b>



<b>Para 2 line 2</b>		
<b>ANNEX 2 Annex II 2.1.2</b>	By the Secretary Latest specifications for new NAVTEX receivers have added “L”, should we change this in the reproduction of the ITU Res?	<b>Discuss</b>
<b>ANNEX 3 MSC.148(77)</b>	By Secretary Added piracy and tsunami. <b>MSC.148(77)</b> should really be up-dated	<b>Discuss</b>
<b>ANNEX 4 3</b>	By Secretary Changed from “Recommendation ITU-R PN.368-7 and ITU R Report 322”	<b>IMO are happy for this to be changed</b>
<b>general</b>	By IHO Co-ordinated and Co-ordinating: In the vast majority of places these two words are used hyphenated however coordinated appears unhyphenated in 3.1.1 (twice) and in 4.2 (once); coordinating appears unhyphenated in Definition 26 on the RCC and the Captions to Figures 2 and 3.  The Co-ordinating Panel is normally referred to as “The IMO NAVTEX Co-ordinating Panel” however in the Table of “B Characters” on Page 16, in 5.3.2 and in 14.1.4.1 it is referred to as “The International NAVTEX Co-ordinating Panel”	<b>All instances replaced with hyphenated version throughout.</b>  <b>Editorial DONE</b>
<b>General</b>	The Argentine Hydrographic Office, as the NAVAREA VI Coordinator, monitors all the NAVTEX stations both from Argentina and Uruguay. Therefore, we think it should be desirable that all items dealing with the Resources and Responsibilities of NAVAREA and National Coordinators be included in the NAVTEX Manual as it was the case with the Manual previous edition. Such items are already included in the Joint IHO/IMO/WMO Manual on Maritime Safety Information (MSI) (July 2009 Edition), and in Resolution A.706(17) as amended.	<b>This is covered by reference to the requirement for this Manual to be used in conjunction with these documents in the 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph of the General Information</b>