

11th CSPCWG-1st NCWG MEETING
Rostock, Germany 27-30 April 2015

Paper for Consideration by NCWG

Relevance of information overlay services with respect to IHO standards

Submitted by:	UK
Executive Summary:	HSSC tasked CSPCWG/NCWG to consider standardization issues related with additional overlay services and provide recommendations as appropriate (New task A22, with priority to complete in 2015)
Related Documents:	HSSC6-05.5D rev1; S-4
Related Projects:	

Introduction / Background.

1. This subject was originally raised by France at IRCC6 May 2014 (IRCC6-08B). IRCC Action 29 was that UK and France address the AIO issue bilaterally and report back to IRCC7 (deadline: IRCC7 June 2015).
2. However, in addition to the IRCC instruction for France and UK to address the issue bilaterally, IHB submitted HSSC6-05.5D rev1 to HSSC6. The introduction to the HSSC paper specified UK's 'Admiralty Information Service' (AIO) as the case in point. In response, and as suggested by IHB, HSSC tasked CSPCWG/NCWG to consider standardization issues related to additional overlay services and provide recommendations as appropriate: New task A22, with priority to complete in 2015 (although the IHB HSSC paper suggested 2016, in time for HSSC8). The IHB made three recommendations which NCWG must consider.

Based on the analysis above, it is recommended that the consideration of standardization issues related with information overlay services should focus on:

- I. Clearly stating that the information included in ENC's and on the corresponding paper charts must be consistent, while acknowledging the differences that may exist between the products in regard to content and the different way that the products are used by the mariner. This can be done in S-4, possibly at B-170 (currently unused).
- II. Strengthening the specifications regarding chart updating to include the requirement for the equivalent of paper chart (T) and (P) NMs to be included as part of the ENC Update service, in S-4 - B-600. In accordance with action HSSC5/02, ENC Producers should be further encouraged to include the equivalent of paper chart (T) and (P) NMs as part of their ENC Update service and advised that not doing so would be non-conformant with IHO specifications.
- III. Recommending that information overlay services must not be produced where the ENC Producer has included the equivalent of paper chart (T) and (P) NMs as part of their ENC Update service.

Analysis / Discussion.

3. Recommendation I: UK concurs with this recommendation. It will be necessary to define exactly what is meant by 'consistent': clearly not the content as such

(noting the second phrase) but that if a feature is shown on both products, the significant details should be consistent (eg position, type of feature, depth over the feature, etc). This should be quite a brief general statement and possibly better follows the introductory section B-100 to B-103, perhaps under a heading such as 'Consistency between chart products'.

4. Recommendation II: The reference HSSC5/02 'invited MS who do not plan to align their ENC and paper chart T&P update regimes to reconsider their position'. Nevertheless, there remain several IHO Member States who do not include T&P NMs as part of their ENC update service. Also, there are other cases of non-conformity with aspects of IHO specifications, both for paper charts and ENC. Such a statement in an official IHO standard may have adverse implications for SOLAS carriage-compliance which would not be welcomed by Member States. We should also consider what (if any) the consequences of non-conformity might be and how it would be monitored?
5. UK suggests that it will be sufficient to alter the 3rd bullet at B-600 to read 'should' instead of 'may', to read: '*A change for which a Preliminary (P) or Temporary (T) NM is issued for a paper chart may should be included as an update to an ENC cell.* It may also be useful to add a reference at B-633 and B-634 to S-57 Appendix B.1 Annex A ENC UOC Clause 2.6.2.2 or .3 respectively for T or P NM action on ENC.
6. Recommendation III: The services offered to users by Service Providers are for those Service Providers to determine.
7. With specific regard to UKHO's Admiralty Information Overlay:
 - ECDIS and IHO always envisaged the production of value added data layers such as AIO, that is after all why it is a 'Chart Display ***and Information*** System'
 - The AIO was born out of customer demand and has two features:
 - EPNMs. It is designed to help the mariner resolve problems (inconsistencies) they may face using ENCs and ECDIS. Especially for those who are navigating in a mixed environment (who remain the significant majority) they need to understand the reason for a difference between the paper chart and ENC. This is basically the same process that has always existed for paper P notices, that is: we have received some information which needs further investigation, or for which the chart cannot yet be fully updated for some other reason, but in the meantime here is some information to which the mariner can apply judgement. The 'further investigation' would include correspondence with the ENC producer to resolve the issue. Sometimes this takes some time, so a temporary method of informing the mariner of a potentially dangerous situation is of significant use to the mariner.
 - T&P information. Port state and SIREs inspectors want to see evidence that a vessel is managing and taking note of T&P information; if they cannot adequately demonstrate this, they get a deficiency. The T&P part of AIO provides visual evidence of where T&Ps apply - both to the inspectors and the crew during passage planning. Even where the T&P information has been incorporated into the ENC, in accordance with the S-57 UOC, this highlighting is still valuable. For example, many P notices may be encoded using DATSTA and DATEND attributes that hide the feature from view until the 'go-live' date; if a mariner does not know that such a feature exists

as they plan a voyage in advance of the go-live, they may not be able to take its effect into account.

- AIO is valuable to the mariner as evidenced by the facts that all the major OEMs have adapted their ECDIS at their own cost to support the service and that major shipping companies are specifying that the ECDIS for their vessels must have AIO capability.
- The new version of S52 addresses, to some degree, the issue of viewing objects coded with DATSTA, DATEND, PERSTA and PEREND attributes, but that will not be fully implemented until late 2016. If at that time users no longer require the AIO functionality, they will stop asking for it and UKHO will stop producing it.

Conclusions.

8. Some additional guidance in S-4 on consistency between paper charts and ENC and their updating processes, specifically for T&P information, would be useful. However, care must be taken not to use language which is beyond the authority or competence of IHO or which could undermine the carriage compliance of MS products.

Recommendations.

9. Recommendation I: Draft a brief general statement on the need for consistency between paper charts and ENC. (Suggested location in S-4 to be B-104, rather than allocate an entire new section B-170).
10. Recommendation II: Alter the 3rd bullet at B-600 to read 'should' instead of 'may'. Add a reference at B-633 and B-634 to S-57 Appendix B.1 Annex A ENC UOC Clause 2.6.2.2 or .3 respectively for T&P action on ENC.
11. Recommendation III: No action based on IHB recommendation 3 above.

Justification and Impacts.

12. The provision by a Service Provider of additional services to mariners is not a matter for IHO.
13. Actions in response to Task 22 should be limited to the minor amendments to S-4 recommended above and subject to MS approval.

Action required of NCWG.

14. The NCWG is invited to consider this submission and endorse the recommendations.