

2nd NCWG MEETING
IHB, Monaco 26-28 April 2016

Paper for Consideration by NCWG

Potential for non-IHO organizations seals being included on charts

Submitted by:	UK
Executive Summary:	New wording was agreed for adding to S-4 B-241.2(I). Is there potential for this revision to have an unintended effect?
Related Documents:	CSPCWG11-09.7A; CSPCWG10-09.6A (and associated CSPCWG10 Action 29); HSSC6-05.5C and HSSC6-05.5F
Related Projects:	None

Introduction / Background:

1. One of the clarifications made to S-4 Edition 4.6.0. was a note added to B-241.2(I) – ‘Seals on international charts’:

Note: The IHO seal must only be used on charts produced by Member States of the IHO. Seals of non-IHO Members may be added to INT charts where the nation or organization has officially delegated its cartographic authority to a chart producer which is an IHO Member State and:

- Has supplied source data upon which it can reasonably assert ownership; or
- Claims copyright and/or intellectual property rights on content; or
- Has contributed some degree of quality control or quality assurance in the chart’s construction.

2. This wording was primarily intended to prevent non-IHO member states from claiming IHO authority by using the IHO seal and thereby claiming their charts to be ‘INT’ charts. It also covered the possibility of seals of non-IHO members being added to INT charts that are produced by IHO members on behalf of another nation. However, it may have an unintended and potentially problematic consequence.

Analysis / Discussion:

3. The use of ‘nation or organization’ in the second sentence of the note above was intended to refer to the national government or its designated official hydrographic organization. However, it may have unintentionally opened the possibility of any ‘organization’ which has some data included on a chart claiming the right to have their seal or logo included on the chart. Potentially, this could include: port authorities; mapping companies; magnetic data suppliers; survey companies; light and buoyage authorities; etc. The potential list is enormous.
4. A recent example seen in UK was the seal of the Norwegian Polar Institute added to an NHS chart. UKHO has resisted pressure to include the logo of another UK government organization on its charts.
5. Source providers can be acknowledged in other ways, for example in the title block. The following example is from an Australian chart.

overhead clearance heights are above Highest Astronomical Tide; all other heights are above Mean High Water Springs.
Positions are related to the World Geodetic System 1984 Datum; (see SATELLITE DERIVED POSITIONS Note).
Navigational marks: IALA Maritime Buoyage System - Region A (Red to port).
Projection: Mercator.
Acknowledgements: Sydney Ports Corporation, Newcastle Port Corporation, Public Works Department.

It would be possible to add something to B-241.10 to cover this option.

Conclusion:

6. A precedent set for one organization could undermine any resistance to other organizations lobbying for their logos to appear on official charts. There is a need to clarify the statement in S-4 B-241.2(l) urgently if it is considered that INT charts (and perhaps national charts) should not be cluttered by, potentially numerous, seals and other logos of non-national and non-hydrographic secondary data supply organizations.

Recommendation:

7. Clarify the note to read something along the lines of:

Note: The IHO seal must only be used on charts produced by Member States of the IHO. Seals of **the designated lead hydrographic authority of** non-IHO Members **States** may be added to INT charts where the nation ~~or organization~~ has officially delegated its cartographic authority to a chart producer which is an IHO Member State and:

- Has supplied source data upon which it can reasonably assert ownership; or
- Claims copyright and/or intellectual property rights on content; or
- Has contributed some degree of quality control or quality assurance in the chart's construction.

Justification and Impacts:

8. To avoid pressure to clutter charts with logos of secondary organizations who have contributed some source data to an INT chart.
9. A small clarification. This may be a rare case where the clarification should be issued urgently, as Edition 4.6.1.

Action required of NCWG:

10. The NCWG is invited to:
 - endorse the above recommendation
 - consider whether a new clarification on 'acknowledgments' should be added to B-241.10.