

## Paper for Consideration by CHRIS

### Re-activation of S-49 “Recommendations concerning Mariners’ Routeing Guides”

<b>Submitted by:</b>	IHB
<b>Executive Summary:</b>	The Committee is requested to consider re-activating IHO Publication S-49, which was published in 1985 and no subsequently revised, in the light of new developments, e.g. the increase of routeing measures and VTS systems, or the questioning by BSHC HOs of the non-INT status of MRGs.
<b>Related Documents:</b>	Explanatory Note by Finland to the 12 <sup>th</sup> BSHC Meeting (annexed to this paper)
<b>Related Projects:</b>	None

#### Introduction / Background

S-49 was published in 1985 based on the Report of an IHO ad hoc Working Group on Special Routeing Guides (Decision No. 29 of the 12<sup>th</sup> International Hydrographic Conference, 1982, refers). This was the only edition of S-49 that was published.

S-49 was listed in the IHO Catalogue of Publications until the year 2000. It disappeared from this catalogue from 2001. However, the reason for this “cancellation” is unclear. There was no IHB circular letter on this matter and it has not been possible to identify why it was removed from the IHO Catalogue.

#### Analysis/Discussion

Following discussion by correspondence between the Chair of BSICC, the Chair & Secretary of the CSPCWG, and the IHB, and the subsequent discussion at the 12<sup>th</sup> BSHC Meeting, it appears that there may be a need to re-activate and revise S-49 in the light of new developments since it was published, e.g. the increase of routeing measures and VTS systems. Also, the statement in Chapter 2.2.5 of S-49 that a Mariners’ Routeing Guide is not recommended to be an “INT” series of product, has been questioned (see Annex A).

#### Conclusions

It may be useful to prepare a revised edition of S-49.

#### Recommendations

See “Action Required of CHRIS” below.

#### Justification and Impacts

- S-49 appears to contain much useful guidance for any HO considering production of a Mariners’ Routeing Guides (MRG), so its content should not be lost. After so many years, and the increase of routeing measures and VTS systems, it is likely that some revision is necessary.
- CSPCWG seems to be the appropriate body to undertake a revision of S-49. This would be the subject of a new Work Item.
- Priority is proposed to be medium.

#### Action Required of CHRIS

CHRIS is invited to examine the appropriateness of revising S-49, based on the above considerations.

## INT Status for Mariner's Routeing Guide Baltic Sea

(29 May 2007)

### Introduction

1. The *Mariner's Routeing Guide Baltic Sea* has been prepared by the HELCOM Expert Working Group on Transit Routeing (HELCOM Transit Route EWG) and printed by Germany. The chart can be seen in the Annex 1.
2. The EWG had in their 10<sup>th</sup> meeting in Helsinki 9-10 May 2007. Following is an extract of the Draft Minutes of the Meeting. *"The meeting discussed the possibilities of obtaining an INT status for the HELCOM Transit Guide for the Baltic Sea and observed that this is not in line with the existing IHO recommendation. The meeting agreed that there is a need to revise the IHO recommendation and invited the Contracting Parties to contact the national representatives in the Baltic regional offices of IHO with this respect. Additionally, the Meeting invited Finland to address this issue at the Exhibition during the IHO XVII<sup>th</sup> Conference in May 2007 in Monaco, where the Guide will be presented."*
3. The IHO XVII Conference was previous to the EWG Meeting and this issue was not raised at the Conference.
4. The EWG meeting refers to the IHO publication S-49 (published 1985). In the Chapter 2.2.5 there is a statement that the MRG is not recommended to be an "INT" series of product. Any clear reason for that is not given.
5. This issue has been discussed via e-mail about one year ago between the chair of BSICC, the secretary of CSPCWG and some experts. Some conclusion seems to be that there is only a little advantage in allocating INT numbers for MRG. The reasons for not to have an INT number have been listed in the table below. At the EWG meeting above there were opinions that INT status would be useful for this kind on official charts. There are listed some counter arguments relevant especially for the Baltic Sea.

Arguments <u>not</u> to have INT number	Counter arguments (discussed at the EWG meeting)
INT charting is mainly about producing harmonized schemes of overlapping charts over wide areas, for SOLAS vessels trading internationally. By their nature, MRG are limited to specific, comparatively small geographical areas.	Baltic Sea is larger than a "small geographic area".
The MRG do not form schemes and are not part of SOLAS carriage requirements.	INT number does not itself indicate mandatory carriage requirement. These charts may however be included to the national lists of required charts.
They include a lot of text that does not make them suitable for bi-lingual versions. Consequently, an adoption of a	This Baltic MRG is indented to be published only in English language.

<b>MRG will need extensive alteration between different producers with different languages.</b>	
<b>The text is generally derived from the producer's own non-INT (national) publications. Consequently, an adoption of a MRG will need extensive alteration between different producers due to the different national publications being referenced.</b>	In this case it has been agreed that Germany will coordinate all updates. The EWG has nominated responsible members who will deliver their updates to Germany.
<b>S-49 (or its successor) will help to harmonize styles; however, because of the different nature of the areas, there would always need to be scope for some inventiveness in how to portray particular situations as clearly as possible.</b>	There are local differences on different sea areas which may have effects to the layout of different MRGs. However, this should not be an obstacle to have common recommendations on the content and lay-out of the MRGs.
<b>Being non-INT is not likely to be any impediment to exchange of repromat, as it is common place for HOs to exchange non-INT repromat by bilateral arrangement.</b>	Are there any copyright or other problems with the Baltic Sea MRG?
<b>MRG are a part of the non-essential products which HOs add to their range of nautical publications (such as leisure products, routeing charts, etc). As such, too strict a specification may not be welcome.</b>	Especially the EWG believes this as a service to the mariners. The situation at the Baltic Sea has been changed during the past years; new systems and co-operation (VTS, AIS, SRS, routeing systems, ice navigation co-operation) has been introduced. It is important to pass this kind of new information reliably and efficiently and cheaply to the users. The MRG is seen as a useful means for this.

6. Finland is asking for a clarification if the IHO recommendations should be revised to allow this kind of chart to have an INT number. If this is found feasible then the IHB may be asked to initiate the revision of the S-49. Perhaps it may be feasible to establish a special number series for this kind of charts.

#### **Actions required from the BSHC 12<sup>th</sup> Conference:**

The BSHC 12<sup>th</sup> Conference is requested to consider this issue and to take appropriate actions.

#### Annex 1: Mariner's Routeing Guide Baltic Sea

**Annex 1: Mariner's Routing Guide Baltic Sea**

