

## UNIFORMITY IN CHARTS AND HYDROGRAPHIC DOCUMENTS

by Captain Ir. W. LANGERAAR  
Hydrographer, Royal Netherlands Navy

---

### **IHB Introductory Note :**

*Captain Langeraar, Hydrographer of the Netherlands, in an article published in the July 1963 issue of the I. H. Review (page 11), raised a question of some importance for the IHB — that of a partial reform of the Repertory of Technical Resolutions.*

*In order to clarify the Bureau's position as much as possible before submitting a formal proposal, the Directing Committee assigned Captain Albini, who compiled the last two editions of the Repertory, to express his own point of view, which was published in the January 1964 issue of the I. H. Review (page 11).*

*Captain Langeraar contributes further on this subject in the following statement.*

*States Members have been provided with the background information on the subject and are in a position to evaluate Captain Langeraar's proposal and to suggest a practical manner of putting it into force. Your comments will assist the Bureau to compile a final wording of a proposal to be submitted by circular letter.*

*The Directing Committee requests the opinion of hydrographic offices on this subject in order to inform States Members through the I. H. Review or the I. H. Bulletin as deemed appropriate.*

In Volume XLI, No. 1, January 1964 of the International Hydrographic Review, Captain C. F. ALBINI, Senior Hydrographic Officer of the IHB, has made some comments on my article in Volume XL, No. 2, July 1963 of the Review. I am grateful to the Directing Committee for giving me the opportunity to say some more on the subject of uniformity.

To begin with, I thank Captain ALBINI for his positive criticism and favourable comments. There are, however, a few details which perhaps escaped his attention and I would very much like to point these out here. In my article I said : " Now the question can be asked whether a change of principle in the Repertory of Technical Resolutions is feasible, and whether the advantages would outweigh the apparent disadvantages inherent in such a change ". From this it is plain that I fully agree with

Captain ALBINI that uniformity is an end which should be achieved progressively, with discretion, and not drastically.

But I am firmly of the opinion that uniformity can only be aimed at successfully by the application of a rigorous system of standardization or normalization, which, in essence, means nothing other than the necessity to take a sequence of consistent decisions. I said this before, and fully maintain it.

One of the main disadvantages of the system of Fundamental and Derived Technical Resolutions, as suggested by me, was seen by Captain ALBINI to be the fact that several Derived Resolutions would follow immediately the relevant Fundamental Technical Resolution, thereby appearing in the Repertory in a more or less haphazard way from the user's point of view. If this were the only possible way to go about this question I would fully agree with Captain ALBINI. It should not be forgotten, however, that my article was a first "sounding" of opinion, and not a final proposal. The whole question of stating underlying principles clearly could very well be resolved as follows.

The Repertory of Technical Resolutions is to consist of two parts. The second part remains as the Repertory is now, i.e. with all resolutions arranged according to their subjects. One small change could perhaps be made by printing the Fundamental Resolutions in bolder type, and by inserting after a Derived Resolution the number of the FTR on which it is based.

The first part of the Repertory of Technical Resolutions should contain only the Fundamental Technical Resolutions verbatim, and the numbers of the DTR's based upon them directly underneath. By this system of cross references the user would be happy with the second part, and the International Hydrographic Conferences engaged in changing or amending existing, and conceiving new resolutions would be safeguarded against inconsistencies by the first part of the Repertory.

I quite agree that a resolution is useful not because it is laid down in the Repertory, but only if it is implemented; and that one should avoid, therefore, passing a resolution which it is not certain that the near totality of States Members will be able to put into practice. This is exactly what I had in mind when I suggested that a Fundamental Technical Resolution would require a two-thirds, instead of a simple, majority to be created or changed. After all it can be expected that a country not being able to implement a proposed resolution will vote against it. Once an FTR is adopted, part one of the Repertory will prevent States Members submitting proposals contrary to this FTR, and International Hydrographic Conferences adopting such proposals. A Derived Technical Resolution would, therefore, in my opinion, require only a simple majority to be created or changed.

But perhaps other Hydrographers have different views on this matter of standardization and it would, perhaps, be profitable if others commented on the standpoint laid down in these articles. This might make a more fruitful discussion possible at the next International Hydrographic Conference, if and when a proposal with the purpose of slightly changing the Repertory of Technical Resolutions were to be submitted.