

**4<sup>th</sup> CSPCWG MEETING**  
**Monaco, 13-15 November 2007**

**Paper for Consideration by CSPCWG**

**The term: ‘Recommended Track’**

<b>Submitted by:</b>	UK
<b>Executive Summary:</b>	Does the use of the term ‘Recommended Track’ have potential to mislead the chart user?
<b>Related Documents:</b>	M4, INT1, IMO Ships’ Routeing.
<b>Related Projects:</b>	none

**Introduction / Background**

During CSPCWG3, it was decided that the term ‘Recommended Anchorage’ may be inferred by the chart user to mean that the anchorage was recommended by the charting authority (raising possible liability issues). Consequently, it was decided that the term should be amended, in M4 and INT1, to ‘Reported Anchorage’. It may be that the same considerations apply to ‘Recommended Track’?

**Analysis / Discussion**

Unlike the ‘Recommended Anchorage’ discussed at CSPCWG3 (2006), a Recommended Track (M4 B432.1 and INT1 M3-6) has an IMO definition:

‘A route which has been specially examined to ensure so far as possible that it is free of dangers and along which ships are advised to navigate’.

Because of this well established definition, which is ‘owned’ by IMO, it would be difficult for hydrographic offices to change the term in the way we did for recommended anchorages. Unfortunately, the definition does not make clear *who* has ‘examined’ or *who* is ‘advising’. It is possible that the chart user may assume that it is the charting authority.

In UK, such recommended tracks come from various sources. Some may be recommended by a local authority, such as a port authority (eg ‘*Recommended track for yachts*’). Others are known to have been established originally for the use of the navy. They appear on charts at some time and are rarely removed, even though they may have been surveyed many years ago and it is not necessarily known whether they are re-surveyed, whether marks are maintained, etc. The original source for other recommended tracks may be known to the HO (eg a hydrographic surveyor’s survey report) or may not be known.

UK’s Mariner’s Handbook has a more detailed explanation, as follows:

**Recommended track.** A track shown on a chart, which all or certain vessels are recommended to follow.

The best known track through an imperfectly charted area or through an intricate channel, or the best track for deep-draught vessels in shallow waters, or the route authorized for vessels of a certain draught, are among the recommended tracks shown on charts.

They are shown by pecked [dashed] lines, with arrows where necessary to show the direction to be followed, but where the tracks are defined by leading marks, whether charted or not, they are shown in firm lines.

In a routeing system, it means a route which has been specially examined to ensure so far as possible that it is free of dangers and along which ships are advised to navigate.

This implies several different applications and, unlike M4, is available to chart users. It may

possibly give some protection against misinterpretation of the term.

It may be argued that a recommended track gives no indication of the size of vessel for which it is recommended. It is therefore for the navigator to decide from an inspection of the charted detail whether the track is suitable for his vessel, and so the burden of responsibility still rests with the navigator. (Exceptions are where there is an authorized draught, a statement is made about what vessels should use it, or a routing element, all of which imply a regulatory authority other than the charting authority).

### **Conclusions**

It is not practicable to change the term. It is less likely to be misinterpreted than 'recommended anchorage', but there is some risk. There are possible ways to mitigate the risk, such as:

- Including an explanation in publications, such as the Mariner's Handbook and/or Annual NM.
- Adding a chart note.

### **Recommendations**

Add an explanation of the potential risk, and recommendations for mitigating it, to M4.

### **Justification and Impacts**

- Reduces possibility of liability claims against hydrographic offices.
- Secretary to draft new paragraph in M4, for approval by WG and eventually by MS.
- After approval, inclusion in next revision of M4.

### **Action required of CSPCWG**

The CSPCWG is invited to consider what action, if any, should be taken, and what the priority should be.