

**6th CSPCWG MEETING
Monaco 1-3 December 2009**

Paper for Consideration by CSPCWG

Progress with B-600 – New Maintenance Section for S-4

Submitted by:	CSPCWG Secretary
Executive Summary:	An update on progress with B-600, the new chart maintenance section for S-4
Related Documents:	S-4.
Related Projects:	None

Introduction / Background

The latest CSPCWG letter on progressing B-600 is 09/2009 (Round 3). This called for responses by 3 September 2009. 17 responses were received, which demonstrates once again the importance the WG attaches to this new guidance. A consolidated list of the responses is at Annex, with the CSPCWG Chairman's comments in red, sloping text.

Analysis / Discussion – see Annex

Recommendations

Attendees at CSPCWG6 are recommended to:

- review the list of responses and the associated Chairman's comments at Annex;
- familiarise themselves with the remaining outstanding issues for discussion (identified by 'track changes' in document CSPCWG6-09.1B).

Justification and Impacts

A discussion may bring a quick and efficient resolution to any outstanding issues, which could be much more prolonged if further correspondence was entered in to.

Action required of CSPCWG

CSPCWG6 is invited to discuss any outstanding issues in order to hasten the review and allow for the circulation of B-600 to IHO Member States.

There may also be considerations arising from discussions at agenda items 9.2 and 9.4 which may impact on B-600.

CONSOLIDATED RESPONSES TO CSPCWG LETTER 9/2009*CSPCWG Chairman's comments in red, sloping text*

No	Spec	Question	YES	NO
1	630.1	Do you agree that the sense of TR F1.5 has been retained in the new wording?	AU, CA, DE, DK, FI, FR, GR, ID, JP, NL, NO, NZ, PK, SE, UK, US, ZA	
		Do we actually need these additional paragraphs? <i>New wording accepted</i>	AU, CA, DE, DK, FI, FR, GR, ID, NL, NO, NZ, PK, SE, US, ZA	ES, JP, UK
2	630.5	Do you agree that NM numbers can be made up of chart number plus periodical number and year date and that this sufficiently complies with the intentions of TR F2.5 so that it can be cancelled? <i>See comment in B-600 Round 4</i>	DE, ES, ID, JP, UK, US, ZA	AU, CA, DK, FI, FR, NL, NZ, PK, SE,
3	631.4	Some alternative suggestions have been made instead of the originally proposed 'instruction terms' for NMs. a. Do you agree with the originally proposed term 'INSERT'? <i>Original term accepted</i>	AU, DE, DK, ES, FI, GR, JP, NL, NO, PK, SE, UK, ZA	CA, FR, ID, NZ, US,
		If you answer 'no' above, which term do you prefer:		
		ADD instead of INSERT	CA, ID, NZ, US,	
		ADD in addition to INSERT	DE, FR	CA
		b. Do you agree with the originally proposed term 'AMEND'? <i>Original term accepted</i>	AU, CA, DK, ES, FI, GR, JP, NL, NO, PK, SE, ZA	DE, FR, ID, NZ, UK, US,
		If you answer 'no' above, which term do you prefer:		
		MODIFY instead of AMEND	DE,	NZ, CA
		CHANGE instead of AMEND	ID, NZ, UK, US	
		c. If you have any other preferences, please indicate below. <i>No changes to original terms</i>	FR, US,	
4	632.3	Contrary to the earlier drafts, FR (see track change document) considers it is better to use a large block to avoid 'mentions'. Do you agree with FR? <i>See revised wording in B-600 Round 4</i>	CA, DE, DK, FR, ID, NL, NO, PK, US, ZA	AU, ES, FI, GR, NZ, SE, UK
5	634.1	Do you consider that an additional category is required to the Miscellaneous Notices and/or General Notices (see 635 and 636) called (I) (for information)? <i>Suggestion not carried</i>	FR, PK,	AU, CA, DK, ES, FI, GR, ID, JP, NL, NO, NZ, SE, UK, US, ZA

Additional comments**AUSTRALIA:** (See also track change copy)

B-630.1: AU does not agree with the guidance that the non-producer nation may issue a (P) NM giving details of the changes. It is up to the producer nation to promulgate NMs applicable to its nautical products. With the initial instruction for non-producer HOs to pass on information as quickly as possible, and with modern

communication methods, this guidance is not required. It is adding additional complexity to the process with regards to non-producer nations. AU therefore recommends that the last sentence in B-630.1 be deleted.

NOTE: If the decision of CSPCWG is to retain this guidance, then consideration needs to be given to adding an additional bullet point at B-634.1, and consideration as to how such (P) NMs are going to be compiled with respect to Charts affected, preceding NM number etc will also be required.

Guidance has been accepted, no further additions required.

B-630.5: The whole point of TR F2.5, as stated in the heading for this TR, is a standard system of numbering of NMs. With all the possibilities defined in this paragraph – inclusion of chart number or sequential number of update for each chart or NM periodical number – this is not moving toward any standardisation (AU agrees with the comment from UK in that adoption of a “standard” method has failed). The TR simply recommends that an arrangement comprising the number of the notice and year of publication be used. It appears that there are varying interpretations of the “Number of the Notice” – there is no mention of chart numbers or periodical numbers in the TR. AU simply assigns a sequential number to each Notice, and appends the year (e.g. 234/09) to create a unique number, as is specified in the first sentence of B-630.5 and a literal translation of the TR.

See comment in B-600 Round 4

B-630.5: TRs F3.5 (3) and F3.6 (2) mandate (“It is resolved that a Notice of a preliminary/temporary nature shall be”) the inclusion of (P) (for preliminary) and (T) (for temporary) NMs. AU therefore suggests that the “should” in the second sentence be changed to “must”.

Agreed & done

B-631: Current heading of this section is “CHART UPDATING NM: TEXTUAL”. In this case, and for the section headings for B-632, B-633 and B-634, NM is used as the abbreviation for Notices to Mariners. This convention has not been used for the section headings for B-635 and B-636. For consistency, the same convention should be used for all the above section headings. AU suggests using the non-abbreviated term, as has been applied in the AU track changed version of B-600. *Agreed & done.*

B-631.4: AU does not agree with “add”, as this could mean adding to something that is already there (similar to “amend”), while “insert” means that something is new.

B-632.2: AU suggests that the “will” in the last line be changed to “must”. If it is considered appropriate, this can be amended to “should”. *Agreed, revised wording proposed.*

B-632.6: Is there any reason why the paragraphs in this clause are prefixed by “a.”, “c.” etc? If so, “b.” is missing. Previous instances of such prefixes being used are when a choice is being offered (e.g. B-631.5), or an ordered list of requirements is given (e.g. B-630.3 and B-630.4 – although these are in the format “a)”, “b)”) etc). AU suggests that the paragraph prefixes be removed from this clause. *Introductory sentence added, ‘b’ reinserted. Too many points for bullets.*

B-633.1 and B-633.2: AU agrees with FR comment in their track-changed version in regard to guidance for the application of temporary NMs for ENC’s, and that this paragraph be deleted.. In addition, AU feels that geo-referencing is important for (T) NMs in regard to the application of the Notice on the paper chart by the user. AU

suggests therefore that a reference to B-631.5 be added at clause 633.2, i.e.:

“The NM number for a (T) NM should be followed by ‘(T)’, before the year date. The specifications at B-631.3 (Title), 5 (Positions), 6 (Authority) & 7 (Charts affected) also apply to (T) NM.” *Agreed & done.*

B-633.2: AU suggests that the “should” in the first sentence be changed to “must” in accordance with TR F3.6 (2) – see AU comment for B-630.5 above. *Agreed & done.*

B-634.1 and B-634.2: As for B-633.1 and B-633.2 above. *Agreed & done.*

B-634.2: AU suggests that the “should” in the first sentence be changed to “must” in accordance with TR F3.5 (3) – see AU comment for B-630.5 above. *Agreed & done.*

B-635: For all other types of NM (chart-updating, (T), (P) and general) there is an introductory clause/paragraph stating the purpose of this type of NM. For miscellaneous NMs, the section begins with Notification of publications. Should there be an introductory clause for miscellaneous NMs? If so, such an introductory paragraph may be similar to:

B-635.1 Miscellaneous NMs are issued to promulgate important new information of significance to the mariner which is not otherwise presented on charts, eg:

- publication of New or New Editions of nautical products;
- cancellation of nautical products;
- changes to information incorporated in Annual NMs (see B-636);
- general international maritime warnings/information eg notification of incidents of piracy;
- changes to navigation services eg changed contact details for VTS or pilot services.

Following clauses in this section would require re-numbering. *Agreed & done*

B-635.2: When a NC or NE with changed limits is published, the referencing limits on smaller (not larger) scale charts need to be amended by NM. *Agreed & done*

B-641: In all other cases in S-4 Part B, whole clause numbers (clause numbers without a “.n” part) are section headings i.e. capitalised, 12 point text. AU suggests that this clause be changed accordingly (see AU track changed version). Amend Contents page accordingly. *Agreed & done.*

B-642: As for B-641 above. *Agreed & done.*

CANADA:

630.5 Canada identifies NMs by chart number and a date. The date that we stamp in the lower left hand corner of our updated charts, is the actual date in which the last correction was approved for inclusion in our NM booklet. The format is YYYY-MM-DD

I invite you to see our numbering system for NMs in the Canadian Coast Guard’s website <http://www.notmar.gc.ca/go.php?doc=eng/services/notmar/index>

631.4 Canada currently uses ADD. It is a better term for the inclusion of a completely new feature rather than insert which could be understood as fitting something in between.

c. We currently use the term AMEND; we do not need both (amend and modify) or to change from what we are currently using and what our clients are used to. So no to using MODIFY.

632.3 Canada does not indicate what features we are changing when issuing a patch (“Block”). Neither do we use “mentions”. The main purpose of the patch is to avoid the work

of explaining a complex NM.

634.1 We don't need additional categories of explanatory notes for Information. It adds extra complication that is not required and would force the user to have to search more categories to find the information they need.

GERMANY:

2: For explanation of the DE system see DE answer to CSPCWG Ltr 03/09 B-621 & B-630.5. The advantage of this system we see that a chart is corrected only at one place in the NtM. With a sequential NM number used for more than one chart you need always the chart number to identify the correction.

3.a: We would prefer (as we already use it) ADD in addition to INSERT for characteristics in the form:

ADD [characteristic] at [existing feature] [position].

The meaning of "feature" should not be used ambiguous. Therefore the first bullet should be like before (see annex to CSPCWG Ltr 3/09) and a separate bullet for ADD can be included. *'Add' not supported by votes.*

4: If possible we use a large size block instead of 'mentions'. *Reworded, following comments by FR and others.*

5: I'm afraid that our approach with the (I) NM has been misunderstood. We did not propose an additional category to the Miscellaneous Notices, but to or instead of some of the (P) NMs under B-634.1 (second bullet) and B-634.3 in the case when the information for the NM is clear and known but very comprehensive. The HO has to inform the user but has to wait with the New edition or the block correction by technical reasons (see example GB 4532 (P) 09).

We think you are suggesting splitting (P) into two categories, ie (P) and (I). This simply increases the number of sections for the user to search, see CA comment above and NZ below.

SPAIN:

630.1.- ES point of view is that it is not conceivable for any HO to issue instructions for correcting another HO's publications. All documents and instructions issue by IHO aim to avoid this circumstance and in the case of inability by any HO it is backed up by the new 'primary charting authority' concept. However, point 2.a in TR F2.5 give cause for more, it considers the possibility to correct any HO's publications without considering the term 'primary charting'. So, it arises a question ¿where is better expressed the fundamental issue, in the TR or in new paragraph 611.7?. It seems more correct what is state in 611.7 than TR. I suggest not to take the TR as an axiom and go ahead with written in 611.7 avoiding to include new words in 630.1.

FRANCE: (See also track change copy)

Nº1 - It is necessary to add this paragraph because it would be unimaginable that an HO issue instructions for correcting another HO's publications and that it is better to avoid all risks even it is so evident! Note that it is also important to say in B-600 that the information must be passed to authority issuing the publications concerned. The paragraph permits to cancel TR F1.5.

Nº2 - NM numbers made up of chart number plus periodical number and year date are not coherent with recommendations in B-631.7 and are no more sequential. See also comment in the draft.

No3 – Use ‘REPLACE [characteristic of feature] with [new characteristic]’ instead of ‘AMEND’.

GREECE:

630.5 – Could you please clarify by an example how this method of numbering would be applied? If for example we have a NM with periodical number 175, year date 2009 (currently numbered as NM 175/09), which affects charts 413/2 and 413/5, how would the chart numbers be added to the NM number, so as to form a unique, sequential NM number? *Example added.*

JAPAN:

2. The example of additional elements is not clear. We need concrete example such as 1234/34/09. *Example added.*

4. Whether it is better to use a large block to avoid ‘mentions’ or not is case by case. We can not say which is better generally. *See revised wording.*

5. Miscellaneous Notices and General Notices do not need to be treated with same weight as navigationally significant Notices.

NORWAY:

I would like to see some examples showing this kind of numbering. *Example added.*

Question from our NM (Efs) people: What could this numbering look like when one NM booklet contains up to twenty different chart correcting messages for one chart. *All twenty would be collected together under one number. (However, if there were actually twenty, a new edition may be more appropriate, to avoid overloading the user).*

NEW ZEALAND :

No.2 630.5

We think that the proposed NM numbering of ‘chart number plus periodical number and year date’ does not achieve international standardisation and does not comply with the intentions of TR F2.5. We agree with AUs comments.

No.3 631.4

We spoke to a colleague who speaks English as a second language. She said that ‘add’ is clearer than ‘insert’ and that ‘change’ is clearer than ‘amend’. When beginning work in NZ she had to ask about the meaning of ‘amend’, which we use in NZ NMs. We think that ‘add’ and ‘change’ are more direct, plain English.

We don’t agree with using ‘add in addition to insert’ as it does not achieve international standardization. *See votes from WG members, where 10 non-English first language members vote for the status quo (which is Latin!).*

631.9 [Copied from covering email] We have the following additional comment: We consider that the textual information in the NM is the official notification, and that the tracing is for guidance only. We have used this comment on occasion when there was a minor error in a tracing but the NM textual information was correct. We suggest adding a sentence at the end of 631.9 stating ‘The tracing is produced for guidance only, with the textual NM being the authority’. *Agreed and done.*

No. 4 632.3

The larger the block, the more difficult it is to follow the established rules for block production (i.e. keeping away from folds, existing blocks and compass roses). For

example, a block would be an ideal solution for a new complex offshore production area. But a large block to include a straight pipeline leaving the production area would be beyond requirement as a ‘mention’ of a few co-ordinates would satisfy chart updating. *See rewording.*

No 5 634.1

NZ has an established process for general information NMs. Such NMs are either issued as Annual NMs as the start of the year or as permanent NMs as they occur during the year. These NMs are issued without reference to specific charts/publications. We think that information (I) NMs are not required.

US:

631.4c: Suggest the use of ‘Relocate [feature] from [position] to [position]’ instead of ‘Move’

SOUTH AFRICA:

630.1. Recommend, delete the 1st paragraph of the additional paragraphs only. *Transferred direct from TR.*

630.5. Recommend, to add a **3rd example** under ‘Additional elements may be added to the NM number, eg...’ at the end of the last sentence. *Example added.*