

15<sup>th</sup> CHRIS Meeting, IHB, Monaco, 10-13 June 2003PRINCIPLES AND A SET OF PROCEDURES  
FOR MAKING CHANGES TO IHO STANDARDS

## Summary of Responses to CL 54/2002 (Annex C)

**RESULTS (34 votes): 31 "Yes", 2 "No" and 1 "Abst."**

| Member States | Do You agree that "Principles and a Set of Procedures for making Changes to IHO Standards", as contained in Annex B to IHB CL 54/2002, be made a new IHO Technical Resolution (TR A1.20)? | Comments  |
|---------------|---|---|
| Argentina     | Yes   | It is important to adopt this IHO Resolution to avoid problems with the incompatibility between systems. All changes suggested should be weighed up by the different bodies (IHO, manufacturers, distributors and users) to avoid these inconveniences.   |
| Australia     | Yes   |   |
| Bahrain       | Yes   |   |
| Brazil        | Yes   |   |
| Canada        | Yes   |   |
| Chile         | Yes   | To align these procedures with communication practice (Decision Processes)  |
| Colombia      | Yes   | The Principles and Procedures are clear. It is recommended that the new standards come into force on approval.  |
| Croatia       | Yes   |   |
| Denmark       | Yes   |   |
| Estonia       | Yes   |   |
| Finland       | Yes   |   |
| France        | No  | <p>There are still a number of inaccuracies which prevent the project being adopted as it stands. The following should be noted in particular, although this is not an exhaustive list:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) the Principles and Procedures for making changes to IHO standards do not only concern electronic charts, contrary to what is implied in the Note at the end of the text.</li> <li>2) Maritime authorities must be systematically involved as soon as safety of navigation is concerned (eg: Principle B and Procedure 6).</li> <li>3) The introductory paragraph should insist on the underlying risks by modifying its third line to read "...high updating costs, dissatisfied users, or indeed can lead to risks for safety of navigation. These principles..."</li> <li>4) The adverb "retrospectively" is used in two places (Principle F and in the Note). We cannot see how this principle can be applied in a practical way.</li> <li>5) Principle D is illogical and even dangerous. We could be asking users to continue to use a system knowing full well that it is not adequate in terms of safety of navigation! We must clearly be more precise and highlight the cases where recognized risks have been identified: we must, in this particular case, go as far as banning its use as long as the anomaly exists.</li> <li>6) An extra paragraph should be added: "The IHO will set up a quality management system for its standards through the IHB".</li> </ol> |

|                |         |   |
|----------------|---------|---|
| Germany        | Yes     |   |
| Greece         | Yes     |   |
| Iceland        | Yes     |   |
| India          | Yes     |   |
| Italy          | Yes     |   |
| Japan          | Abstain | <p>It is too early to vote and therefore this vote itself is invalid, due to the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) As for the 13<sup>th</sup> CHRIS meeting, from which the idea for this vote originated, establishment of principles and set of procedures to make changes to IHO standards were circulated among other IHO committees and working groups, and it was agreed upon to seek opinions. However this issue is not being discussed in other IHO committees and working groups. Each State is being asked to vote according to the procedure that was different from what was agreed upon in the 13<sup>th</sup> CHRIS Meeting. Therefore we think this voting method is invalid.</li> <li>2) It is premature and inappropriate to vote on generalizing and adding to the IHO technical resolution, such a draft T.R that has not been discussed in IHO committees and working groups other than CHRIS in spite of that it is to be applied to IHO standards in general; It should go through the discussions in IHO committees and working groups other than CHRIS.</li> </ol>  |
| Korea, Rep. of | Yes     |   |
| Kuwait         | Yes     |   |
| Mozambique     | Yes     |   |
| Netherlands    | No      | <p>The text seems to be directed too much towards purely technical ENC/ECDIS standards. But within IHO there exists also other standards, like Standards of competence (Hydr. Surveyors), or Standards for Hydr. Surveys, or standards for lists of lights. And of course the standards for Paper Charts. The wording seems to be less appropriate to cover these standards.</p> <p>Change is often a growing process. In many cases the need for a change will be established within the relevant working group. It seems appropriate that within that group a first probe of the necessity and the nature of the change will be made. An individual (nation) will not always be in a position to oversee in advance the total recommended action list and a time frame.</p> <p>As an example I mention the recent CSC discussions about the depiction of nature reserves and related objects, like ESSA's, PSSA's, coral concentration etc..</p> <p>In such cases it seems to be better that the relevant commission or working group internally discusses the matter before presenting it to the IHB.</p> <p>At some stage of that process then IHB needs to be informed, so that the "Change procedure" can involve also other relevant groups.</p> |
| New Zealand    | Yes     |   |
| Norway         | Yes     |   |
| Portugal       | Yes     |   |
| Singapore      | Yes     |   |
| South Africa   | Yes     |   |
| Spain          | Yes     | Spain supports the formalisation of the aforementioned Principles as a new IHO Technical Resolution.  |
| Sweden         | Yes     |   |
| Thailand       | Yes     |   |
| Tunisia        | Yes     | These new Principles and set of Procedures for making changes to IHO standards will enhance the hydrographic product quality and its liability. Involvement of all parties on this matter will help to improve IHO Standards.   |
| Turkey         | Yes     | 1. "Monopoly in the market" should be added in the first paragraph of the Principles. Improvements to standards and systems only come about by change, however, changes can   |

|            |     |   |
|------------|-----|---|
|            |     | <p>cause incompatibility between systems, high updating costs, monopoly on the market and dissatisfied users. These Principles have been drafted to try and avoid this.</p> <p>2. Item A in the Principles; “and tested (where applicable)” should be added after assessed;</p> <p>“A. Any proposed changes to existing standards need to be technically and commercially assessed <b>and tested (where applicable)</b> before approval.”</p> <p>3. Following sentence should be added as a separate item;<br/>“Changes shall not cause to decrease the number of available systems unless it is essential for the sake of Safety of Navigation.”</p> |
| UK         | Yes |   |
| USA (NOAA) | Yes | <p>However, provision should be made for instances when a change is recommended within one of these committees, for example such as TSMAD. We would assume that TSMAD (in the example) would evaluate its own submission favourably and accept the proposal.</p>  |