

18th CHRIS MEETING
Cairns, Australia, 25-29 September 2006

Paper for Consideration by CHRIS 18

Status of Electronic Charting Issues before IMO

Submitted by: IHB

Executive Summary:

CHRIS is invited to consider whether any IMO activities over the last year may affect the CHRIS's deliberations or require IHO response.

Reference Documents:

- A. IMO NAV 52/17/3
- B. IMO NAV 52/WP.8
- C. IHB CL 54/2006 dated 24 July 2006

Introduction / Background:

1. At the 52nd session of the IMO Sub-Committee on Safety of Navigation, held at IMO Headquarters in London from 17 – 21 July 2006, there were several discussions of importance to CHRIS. A brief synopsis is provided for the benefit of related discussions at CHRIS 18.

Discussion:

2. The Technical WG considered, inter alia, the revision of the ECDIS PS. The deliberations on the ECDIS PS were based around the proposals from the Correspondence Group led by Norway NAV52/5 and NAV52/5/1 but also included consideration of the proposals from CIRM (NAV52/5/2) and the Russian Federation (NAV51/6/2). The Sub-Committee agreed with the WG that these Performance Standards were now mature enough to be sent to MSC for adoption, one year earlier than planned. The text that will go to the MSC is in NAV52/WP.4/Add.1. As part of its discussion on the PS it was agreed that there was a need to issue some further guidance regarding datum issues when using ECDIS in RCDS mode and consequently the Sub-Committee prepared a draft SN Circular which is in documents NAV52/WP.9 and NAV52/WP.9/Corr.1. The text in these two documents was subject to some further editorial amendment and the final text will be included in the Sub-Committee's report NAV52/18 and issued in the SN Circular.
3. WG3 on ECDIS and ENC development, chaired by Frode KLEPSVIK the Norwegian Hydrographer, prepared a revised text for SN/Circ.207 on the "Differences between RCDS and ECDIS". The text prepared was accepted by the Sub-Committee subject to a final review at NAV53 in July 2007 at which time it is hoped that the MSC will have adopted the revised ECDIS PS. WG3 also considered document NAV52/6/1 submitted by the IHO regarding the online comprehensive catalogue of available official charts. (Note that in the revised ECDIS PS this has been referred to as the IHO database.) The Sub-Committee

accepted the proposed structure of the catalogue with one amendment and this now reads as follows:

- .1 ENC;
- .2 RNCs where ENCs are not available;
- .3 Coastal States' recommendation on appropriate folio of up-to-date paper charts for areas where ECDIS is operated in RCDS mode; and
- .4 Index of all globally available paper charts.

The IHO has been invited to continue work on the technical development of this catalogue with a view to demonstrating the catalogue at NAV53.

4. Closely linked to the discussion on the IHO online catalogue was the preliminary discussion, under "Any other business." on a Carriage Requirement for ECDIS. This followed the submission of a document by Denmark and Norway (MSC81/23/13). It was generally accepted that any mandatory carriage requirement for ECDIS should be linked to the adequate availability of ENCs. This matter will be considered further at NAV53 and NAV54. The IHO has been invited to provide updated information to NAV53 regarding the coverage of available ENCs together with an indication of future increases in availability. There is a need for MS to increase the availability of ENCs and WEND should seek further updated information from MS via a separate CL.
5. The Sub-Committee gave preliminary consideration to the development of an E-Navigation strategy as proposed in document MSC81/23/10. The Sub-Committee agreed to establish a CG under the chairmanship of the United Kingdom. The ToR of the CG are given in paragraph 17.30 on page 49 of NAV52/WP.6. The point of contact for the CG is ian.timpson@dft.gsi.gov.uk. ECDIS will of course be a major feature of any such strategy.
6. The IHO submitted a proposal to MSC (MSC 81/24/4) regarding the provision of additional guidance for the Voluntary IMO Member State Audit Scheme. The MSC passed this matter to both the Sub-Committee on Flag State Implementation (FSI) and to NAV for further consideration. The Sub-Committee agreed with the conclusions of FSI14 that there was justification for an amendment to the Code (Resolution A.973(24)) to move SOLAS 74 regulation V/4 (Navigation Warnings) and regulation V/9 (Hydrographic Services) from Annex 1 to Annex 3 which covers "specific coastal State Activities". It was also agreed that the text of the additional guidance should be considered for inclusion in the Framework and Procedures (Resolution A.974(24)). However it was acknowledged that the Council did not wish to consider amendments to these documents until such time as sufficient experience in their operation had been achieved. It was noted that those States that had used the additional guidance in the conduct of trial audits had reported it to be very useful. The Sub-Committee agreed to support the proposal from FSI that the MSC should make this additional guidance available to both auditors and auditees until such time as it is decided to amend the resolutions.

Action Required of CHRIS18:

7. CHRIS 18 is invited to consider the information to decide whether any action by IHO MS is required, and if appropriate make any necessary recommendations to effect by this action.