

INTERNATIONAL HYDROGRAPHIC
ORGANIZATIONORGANISATION HYDROGRAPHIQUE
INTERNATIONALE

STANDARDIZATION of NAUTICAL PUBLICATION WORKING GROUP (SNPWG)

[A Working Group of the Hydrographic Services and Standards Committee (HSSC)]

Chairman: Jens SCHRÖDER-
FÜRSTENBERG jens.schroeder-fuerstenberg@bsh.de

Vice-Chairman: Thomas LOEPER thomas.loeper@noaa.gov

Secretary: vacant

SNPWG Letter: 02/2014

To SNPWG Members

Date 09 October 2014

Dear Colleagues,

Subject: Suggestions to improve the Radio Service ProdSpec test sample data

References: SNPWG Letter 01/2014

Thank you to the 3 SNPWG members who responded to Letter 01/2014: UK, US (NGA) and Jeppesen. The respondents provided suggestions which have been discussed and which are summarised below:

UK

1. Add a reference to **coverage diagrams/charts** if appropriate in the Radio Weather Services and Navigational Warnings section (NAVTEX, BONBONKREMA MRSC, BONBONKREMA (ZZZ) [9999]) and in the radio facsimile section (BONBONKREMA)

Commentaire [AR1]: Two charlets inserted into the document

US (NGA)

1. Internet Weather Services--**add what languages are available** (Recommendation--English, French, and Jusslandian).
2. SAFETYNET (EGC SAFETYNET System table)--Is this attribute part of this data set always "SAFETYNET?" **Should we use "MSA Provider" to make it more versatile in order to include other information providers (ie: Irradium, etc.)?**

Commentaire [AR2]: Done

Commentaire [AR3]: I don't think so. Currently Inmarsat (SafetyNet) is the only satellite provider recognized by IMO in the GMDSS.

Jeppesen

1. The absence of certain **accompanying graphics** at the sections already mentioned by the UK.
2. **We assume empty cells (Kipassebien & Jentendlamer in Bonbonkrema MRSC) mean the station does not transmit (Jentendlamer) or receive (Kipassebien).**
3. If the sample data is intended to be the reference for testing the capabilities of display devices, some kind of graphics should be included. The pictograms for telephone and fax are noted but they present a different set of issues. **Perhaps the question of graphics can be dealt with separately, in a different test dataset, e.g., S-122?**

Commentaire [AR4]: Two charlets inserted into the document

Commentaire [AR5]: True. Frequencies were amended in the table (transmission and reception frequencies are different but close)

Commentaire [AR6]: This is a common issue on several product specifications. That may be a topic to discuss during the next meeting. Do you have any recommendations on this?

We kindly request France (SHOM) to consider the comments and to provide a revised version of the test data set at the earliest convenience but at the latest by the SNPWG18 meeting.

This letter is for SNPWG information only and does not require a response by others than France.

Yours sincerely,

Jens Schröder-Fürstenberg

Chairman