

17th CHRIS MEETING
Rostock, Germany, 5-9 September 2005

Paper for Consideration by CHRIS

AGENDA ITEM 13.2: Port Security Limits

Charting of Port Security Limits

1. Summary

<i>Submitted by:</i>	IHB
<i>Executive summary:</i>	Following a request for guidance by Australia on the charting of port security zones and limits (Doc. CHRIS16-INF4), the 16 th CHRIS meeting asked the IHB (Decision No.14) to seek responses from MS on whether and where such limits should be included: chart products or nautical publications or both. This was done with CL 22/2005 and the results were promulgated in CL 61/2005/Rev.1. Ecuador's answer was subsequently received and has been included in the response table.
<i>Actions to be taken:</i>	It is proposed that the survey results, as in Annex A to CL 61/2005/Rev.1, be discussed at CHRIS/17 and that guidance on the matter be provided as appropriate.
<i>Related documents:</i>	CHRIS16-INF4; CL 22/2005; and CL 61/2005/Rev.1

2. Introduction / Scope

Noting that there is no international guidance on whether the boundaries of port security zones need to be shown on charts and/or described in nautical publications, Australia requested that the IHO considers providing such guidance (see CHRIS16-INF4). The matter was discussed at CHRIS/16 and it was agreed that the IHB would seek MS' views (Decision No. 14). This was done with CL 22/2005 and the results were promulgated in CL 61/2005/Rev.1.

3. Analysis/Discussion.

A summary of responses to CL 22/2005 is annexed to this paper. It results that 16 MS, out of 35 responses, are in favour of showing port security limits on charts whereas 27 MS support their description in nautical publications.

4. Benefits.

To be determined.

5. Working Groups.

To be determined.

6. Other relevant information.

None.

7. Priority.

To be determined.

8. Target completion date.

To be determined.

9. Action Required.

It is proposed that the annexed survey results be discussed by CHRIS and that guidance on the charting of ports security limits be provided as appropriate.

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO CL 22/2005 (Annex A to CL 61/2005/Rev.1 + Ecuador)**CHARTING OF PORT SECURITY LIMITS**

CL 22/2005 asked the following question:

Taking into consideration Australia's request for guidance on charting of port security limits, as reported in [Doc. CHRIS16-INF4](#), are you of the opinion that such administrative borders should be:

- a. shown on nautical charts?
- b. described in relevant nautical publications?

CL 22/2005 Question	a	b	Comments
Member State	Yes	Yes	
Algeria	X	X	
Argentina		X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Its inclusion on charts is not necessary, as it does not contribute to the purpose of the chart. b. A brief description of the concerned area could be included in the Sailing Directions.
Australia	X	X	<p><u>Nautical Charts:</u> The following areas will be shown on paper charts published by the Australian Hydrographic Office:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Outer Limits of a legislated Security Regulated Port. Outer Limits means the over water limit to seaward of the port and limits in waterways within the port. Limits on land will not be shown. <p>Areas <u>not to be shown</u> on paper charts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Areas within ports [Unless specifically requested. No requests to date] b. Ship Security Zones of any type c. Onboard Security Zones d. Limits on land of a legislated Security Regulated Port. <p><u>Nautical Publications:</u> The Australian Seafarers Handbook ABP 20 discusses Port Security. In chapter 2 - Maritime Organizations, the Australian Office of Transport Security (OTS) is discussed. In Chapter 11 Ship Operations the ISPS Code, Australian implementation and contact details for the OTS Operations Centre are discussed.</p> <p>Under the first review of the handbook about to occur, it has been identified that for the "Port Details Table" [Chapter 12, Port Information], a column titled "Security" under "First Ports of Entry" may be required.</p>

CL 22/2005 Question	a	b	Comments
Member State	Yes	Yes	
Belgium			
Brazil	X	X	
Canada	X	X	
Croatia	X	X	
Denmark		X	Denmark has been asked by one of the major harbour authorities to show these limits/areas either on the chart or in a relevant publication. In cooperation with the harbour authority it was decided to describe the area concerned in a separate chartlet in the Danish harbour pilot.
Ecuador	x	x	It is important to include on charts information on safety limits, so that this data can be available to ships.
Finland			
France	X	X	<p>The term and concept of "security zone" do not appear in the ISPS code: these zones are the result of national regulations and not all countries plan to create any (e.g. France).</p> <p>As regards the original nautical documents produced by France, SHOM does not envisage dealing with such zones (if they were created) in any special way compared to any other restricted access zone. These zones would therefore be considered on a case by case basis, taking into account the impact on users, cluttering of the chart, the position of the zones within or outside the port limits, the complementarity between the sailing directions and nautical charts.</p> <p>Using the sailing directions, which, on top of the local features, describe the general conditions, enables the specificities of the merchant navy and the Navy to be taken into account, who, having a good knowledge of the ins and outs of the ISPS code, do not require as much explicit information as yachtsmen and fishermen for whom the access restrictions must be specified in detail.</p> <p>On charts reproduced in facsimile copies from foreign charts, or for compilation charts covering waters outside of SHOM's charting responsibility, the best solution would be to base oneself on the foreign charts used (consistency with the updating notices, the editions, the sailing directions, the ENC's).</p> <p>Coming back to the question of symbology, France is opposed to the creation of specific symbols as the CSCPWG has done for the ESSA, PSSA or ASL (too many symbols impair the reading of a nautical chart and lead to an undesirable cluttering of the chart). The symbols available for the other restricted access zones are more than sufficient.</p>

CL 22/2005 Question	a	b	Comments
Member State	Yes	Yes	
Germany		X	a. Port security limits do indicate facts which are not directly related to ship operations. In addition, those limits are usually related to areas for which special conditions apply. Marking such areas on top of harbour and adjoining land facilities would potentially mask other important chart information. b. A description of applicable conditions and the depiction in simplified chart schemes as part of sailing directions or special booklets would be an appropriate solution.
Greece			
Iceland		X	
India		X	a. Charting of port security limits on charts may increase the amount of clutter on paper charts. b. It is recommended that port security limits be indicated in respective port orders/pilots.
Iran			Due to some ambiguity, this issue needs to be further discussed and clarified.
Italy		X	
Japan	X	X	
Netherlands			a. Possibly a reference to port security regulations in a cautionary note on the chart. b. Possibly a reference to port security regulations in relevant nautical publication(s).
New Zealand	X	X	
Norway			Such information should only exist in port security plans.
Peru			
Philippines	X	X	To be shown on nautical charts to clearly define security jurisdiction and guide mariners, port security implementors and other port users. To be described in relevant nautical publications, as a means of checking security zone delimitation particularly when limits are described in geographical coordinates.
Portugal	X	X	
Singapore		X	If the intent is to specifically address the "Port Security Zone" as defined under the ISPS Code, then it should be stated accordingly. Otherwise it may be subjected to different interpretation and usage. This matter has to be further discussed at the next CHRIS Committee Meeting.
Slovenia	X	X	
South Africa		X	
Spain		X	The need to indicate safety limits in ports is an aspect which, like others, must be taken into consideration by each HO. When required, this should be done using the existing symbology.

CL 22/2005 Question	a	b	Comments
Member State	Yes	Yes	
Sweden		X	<p>a. After having received the first announcements on the establishment of “ISPS-areas” we realized that it wouldn’t be possible to show the extent of the areas on affected charts due to inadequate scale. We however decided to insert a “note” giving information about the locality of the restricted area and information about whom to contact to obtain further information. However we soon learnt that there could be many small “ISPS-areas” within one port. Hence the “notes” on the chart, in many cases, must be quite extensive to supply the mariner with information of any value, risking clutter on paper charts. Hence we decided to not even show a “note” on the chart. Information about this decision was promulgated in Swedish NtM 2005.59/2454.</p> <p>b. Information about each new “ISPS-area” will be issued in the Swedish NtM, including a chartlet and a list of coordinates. All these notices will later on be compiled into a document which will be available on the Internet (www.sjofartsverket.se). New editions of Swedish Pilot Books will most likely include this information.</p> <p>We will await a recommendation from IHO, before we start to digitise the areas for ENC. Recommendations from IHO, and further experiences gained, could of course make us revise the decisions described above.</p>
Thailand	X	X	
Tunisia		X	<p>a. Depicting the limits of port security zones on charts will cause an overload on the chart without adding any information related to the safety of navigation.</p> <p>b. Such information can be described in relevant nautical publications so that mariners will be aware of the existence of port security zones and limits. A Nautical publication is a sufficient medium for wide promulgation of this information to mariners.</p>
Turkey	X	X	
Ukraine	X	X	<p>a. Port water area limits should be shown on large scale charts. In ENCs they should be coded as plane object with indication of port name. On paper charts, by INT1 symbology IN49, according to M-4 B-430.1 (by dotted line in magenta with legend “port limit...” along it, mainly from that side of line which is under port jurisdiction).</p> <p>b. In nautical publications containing ports descriptions it is advisable to describe clear port water area limits, mainly indicating precise co-ordinates, if port limit extends to the sea and is not within isolated harbour, basin, bay, etc.</p>
UK			<p>a. Not to be shown on charts, unless there is a physical barrier.</p> <p>b. Not to be described in nautical publications, unless there is a specific requirement.</p>

CL 22/2005 Question	a	b	Comments
Member State	Yes	Yes	
USA	X	X	<p>Water Areas regulated by United States Government agencies are announced in the Federal Register (FR) and the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), published by the National Archives and Records Administration. These areas are designated to prevent damage or marine casualties, to protect waterfront facilities and to safeguard ports, harbors, vessels and the environment by restricting access to authorized persons and vessels. Among the most common designations are, Danger Zone, Regulated Navigation Area, Restricted Area, Safety Zone and Security Zone. Limits and the regulations within these zones are published in the U.S. Coast Pilot.</p> <p>Federally Regulated Areas are charted by NOAA upon publication in the FR or CFR. On rare occasions, areas are charted at the request of the cognizant agency without codification in the FR or CFR.</p>
Totals	15	26	

In summary, out of 35 responses, 16 are in favour of showing port security limits on charts and 27 support their description in nautical publications.