

A STANDARDISED FORM OF NOTICES TO MARINERS.

proposed by the

DIRECTING COMMITTEE OF THE INTERNATIONAL HYDROGRAPHIC BUREAU.

(See Circular Letter No. 1-H of 1934 and *International Hydrographic Bulletin* No. I of 1934, pages 7 to 9).

The Bureau has now received replies from 25 countries or authorities to Circular Letter No. 1-H of 1934 in which a standardised form of Notices to Mariners was proposed. The attached list shows that 20 countries are in favour of General Standardisation, 3 of Qualified Standardisation and one is against Standardisation; also that 18 countries are in favour of the proposed Form of Notices, 2 suggest amendments to same and 5 are definitely against it.

COUNTRY.	<i>In favour of General Standardisation.</i>	<i>In favour of proposed Form.</i>	<i>Remarks.</i>
NORWAY.....	Yes	Yes	Proposes to group Notices by OCEANS.
EGYPT	Yes	Yes	
CANADA, H. O.	Yes	Yes (if adopted).	Does not issue Notices but will bring it to the attention of the Department concerned.
LATVIA	Yes	Yes (so far as circumstances permit).	
GREAT BRITAIN.....	Yes	Yes	See more detailed reply.
AUSTRALIA	Yes	Yes	See more detailed reply from Great Britain.
NETHERLANDS	Yes (qualified).	No	See more detailed reply.
YUGOSLAVIA	Yes	Yes	
GREECE	Yes	Yes	
BRAZIL	Yes	Yes	
URUGUAY	Yes	Yes	

<i>COUNTRY.</i>	<i>In favour of General Standardisation.</i>	<i>In favour of proposed Form.</i>	<i>Remarks.</i>
ESTONIA.....	Yes	Yes	Will adopt same after definite proposals.
POLAND	Yes	Yes	Has adopted same from 1934.
ARGENTINA	Yes	Yes	
JAPAN	Yes	Yes	Has already adopted same.
GERMANY.....	Yes	Yes	Except that No. and Year are given instead of No. and Date.
SWEDEN.....	Yes	Yes	Will possibly adopt same from beginning of 1935 in Notices regarding Swedish waters.
SIAM.....	Yes	Yes	
U. S. OF AMERICA, H. O.	No	No	See more detailed reply.
U. S. OF AMERICA (Bureau of Light-houses).....	Yes (to some degree)	No	do
CHINA.....	Yes	Yes	Has already adopted same.
ECUADOR.....	Yes	Yes	
MEXICO.....	Yes	Yes	
DENMARK	—	No	See more detailed reply.
FRANCE	Yes (provided no extra expense is entailed).	No	do

Yes.....	20	18
Qualified Yes	3	2
No	1	5

The following is a synopsis of the individual replies received :—

NORWAY : Agrees in general with the proposed standardised form, but considers it an advantage to group the Notices by OCEANS.

EGYPT : Considers it an excellent suggestion that Notices to Mariners should be standardised.

CANADA : Sees no objection, at present, to the proposal to standardise these forms and considers that there appear to be a number of advantages thereby.

The Canadian Hydrographic Office does not issue Notices to Mariners but in the event of a standardised form being adopted for universal or international use, will be pleased to bring it to the attention of the Department concerned.

LATVIA : Has no objection to proposed scheme and is ready to consider and follow it so far as circumstances permit, but considers that the best schemes for unification of nautical information cannot always be followed as a whole.

GREAT BRITAIN : Are in favour of standardisation on lines indicated.
and AUSTRALIA : Consider that (1) if a position is defined by Latitude only such position must have reference to the *largest* scale chart affected; (2) charts affected should appear in order of their scales, the largest coming first; (3) the practice of defining positions by difference of Latitude and Longitude from a well defined object is unsuitable. If graduations of different scales differ appreciably and it is impracticable to use bearings and distances, the Latitude and Longitude for other scales is given; (4) points 2 to 5 inclusive on page 8 of *International Hydrographic Bulletin* No. I of 1934 are in concordance with established practice except that size of corrections in 5 cannot always be the same as that of publication affected.

The sequence proposed is that already adopted except with regard to date. It is at present under discussion to insert Number and Date at foot of each Notice instead of Number and Year.

NETHERLANDS : Are in favour of general standardisation, but consider there are two objections to proposed form: (1) expense; (2) that it would be a disadvantage for the sailor, who does not want changes. Any advantage nationally would be so small that it would not outweigh the above-mentioned disadvantages.

YUGOSLAVIA : Agrees to unification and will adopt the proposal in its entirety.

GREECE : Is in accord with the proposal. Suggests, with reference to (1) on pages 7 and 8 of *International Hydrographic Bulletin* No. I of 1934, that the position of a Light or Buoy etc. shall be given first as accurately as possible by Latitude and Longitude according to the chart quoted, and secondly by bearing and distance from an object which is shown on the most important charts.

BRAZIL : Is entirely in accord with the proposed standardisation.

URUGUAY : Considers that the adoption of a standardised form is of international utility and agrees to the suggestions put forward. The few small differences which at present exist will shortly be abolished.

ESTONIA : Is in favour of general standardisation, and will adopt same after receiving definite proposals.

POLAND : From 1934 has adopted the standardised form as proposed.

ARGENTINA : Supports the proposal for general standardisation as proposed.

JAPAN : Is quite in favour of general standardisation. The system now followed is already in line with the sequence proposed.

GERMANY : Notices are already issued in proposed standard form except that the Number and Year are given and not the Number and Date.

SWEDEN : Considers that standardisation would be of considerable value. With reference to pages 7 and 8 of *International Hydrographic Bulletin* No. I of 1934, (3) is already in force and (1), (2) and (4) will be followed henceforth; (5) does not apply as such publications are not issued. The proposed sequence will evidently entail augmentation in cost of printing but it is possible that from the beginning of 1935 the Notices, at least those regarding Swedish waters, may be compiled according to this sequence — no definite answer can, however, be given at present.

SIAM : Is in favour of general standardisation on the lines suggested.

U. S. OF AMERICA, H. O. : Does not favour a standardisation that will require any considerable change from the form and sequence at present adopted by them, which it is considered meets the convenience of the particular body of mariners who use their Notices. Nor is it believed that standardisation pursued to the point recommended is desirable. Is in favour, however, of a limited standardisation especially as to practices such as are enumerated under (1), (2) and (3) of pages 7 and 8 of *International Hydrographic Bulletin* No. I of 1934. As regards (4) sees no reason for including an "abridged description that is to be inserted on the largest scale chart affected" as it is considered that, except for the one largest scale chart, the judgement of the corrector must be used in correcting all others. As regards (5), material for the correction of Radio Aids to Navigation is published in a format suitable for pasting in the book, but it has not been considered necessary to issue corrections to Light Lists in this form because of expense and because most Light Lists are issued annually.

Would be unwilling to change the sequence of their Notices unless it were clearly apparent that some logical reason existed favouring one proposal over another, or that absolute standardisation were demanded with a certain degree of unanimity.

U. S. OF AMERICA, BUREAU OF LIGHTHOUSES : Considers that its present form of Notices meets the need of navigators using its waters. While appreciating the value of some degree of standardisation, considers that it would not be desirable nor feasible to follow in detail the style proposed as it would be less convenient and more expensive without corresponding gain. Considers, however, that there are some points brought out to which it desires to give further study in consultation with the Coast and Geodetic Survey and other agencies concerned.

CHINA : Approves of Form suggested which compares closely to that already used.

ECUADOR : Is in favour of general standardisation and does not raise any objection to the proposals put forward.

MEXICO : Has no objection to raise and adheres to the proposal put forward.

DENMARK : Is not in favour of proposed Form as it is considered a short descriptive note is better in most cases, taking less space and therefore being less expensive.

With regard to the proposed sequence it is recommended that the positions of the "Authority" (11) and "Reference to former Notices" (4) be interchanged (see page 9 of *International Hydrographic Bulletin* No. I of 1934). As Danish Notices are only issued once a week, the Date and Year of publication will appear on the front page only and not in each of the Notices. It is considered possible that the proposed system might prove practical for Notices which are issued singly, but for weekly editions the following procedure is recommended :-

- (1) Country, Sea, Name and short description, e. g. Light established.
- (2) Authority (in brackets).
- (3) Descriptive note giving full particulars.
- (4) Reference to former Notices, charts and publications affected in brackets below the Notice.

FRANCE : (1) Agrees that it is incontestable that standardisation would be desirable if it did not entail an increase of personnel and expense. The proposed scheme would, however, have the effect of causing such increase of expenditure as circumstances do not enable her to consider.

(2) Agrees that if Notices were arranged according to a common pattern the use of translators for some languages would not be necessary.

(3) Points out that her chart notices assure the correction of each individual chart in an identical way, thus enabling those used in her Navy to be taken back to stock and re-issued.

(4) Agrees that it would be advantageous to give positions by bearing and distance from a conspicuous point and not by Latitude and Longitude, but that the use of geographical co-ordinates is very convenient and that it is in this direction that improvement should be sought after.

(5) Points out that the pasting in of corrections to nautical documents has long been abandoned in France and that, in particular, the considerable number of corrections made to Lists of Radio Signals does not encourage a return to this method. As the Light Lists include an annual supplement, correction sheets are not included in the weekly Notices in such form.

It will thus be seen that a large majority of States are in favour of the proposed scheme and the Directing Committee are satisfied that if and when it is *universally* adopted a considerable benefit to seamen will be attained.

