Annex A

**Report of WG1 – Mobile AtoN.**

**Guiding Principles for any further development of the MAtoN Concept**

At ARM9, the committee considered that there was a need to provide direction for any further development of the IALA guidance on Mobile AtoN’s. The committee discussed the importance of correctly defining and developing the concept of a MAtoN.

As a result of the discussions in Plenary, the ARM9 committee agreed that the following principles will guide any further development of IALA guidance on MAtoN.

**Guiding Principles**

1. The name must refer to its purpose- marking a hazard to navigation.
   1. Name of MAtoN needs to change
   2. Recommendation requires prompt withdrawal and review
   3. Action: Rename MAtoN (Mobile xxx xxx)
2. Providing for the requirements of Nairobi International Convention on the Removal of Wrecks 2007.
   1. The MAtoN is intended to assist both IALA and the State Party in compiling with the obligations of Article 8 of the Nairobi International Convention on the Removal of Wrecks, 2007, which related directly to the marking of hazards to navigation created by wrecks, whether drifting or aground.
3. MAtoN should only be used where the hazard needs to be marked to enhance situation awareness and assist navigation
   1. Fits into Group A AMRD’s.
   2. Never used for Group B AMRD.
4. Many, but not all, of the use cases can be appropriately marked using existing marking arrangements
   1. Action: Reduce the scope of use for a MAtoN to be for a very specific, predefined purpose.
5. This needs to be a ‘unique’ AtoN
   1. Cannot be confused for any other AtoN
   2. Colour and shape
   3. Day mark
   4. Unique Light Character
   5. Any AIS Name prefixed with “Mobile”
   6. Consideration should be given to the colour scheme proposed by Norway Coastal Administration
6. Reporting and Updating
   1. Must automatically and consistently update its position
   2. Must always be deployed with supporting Maritime Safety Information
   3. Must report, as accurately as possible, the true location of the hazard (not and estimate or general area)
   4. A MAtoN must always be recovered when the hazard no longer exists.
7. Physically attached to the Hazard.
   1. Any MAtoN must be physically attached to the hazard.
8. Use of AIS
   1. Virtual MATON will create excessive confusion to mariners, therefore are not permitted.
   2. Amendment to Table 74, Message 21, ITU-R M 1371-5 for any new symbol is essential. New Code and Type may be necessary.
   3. We must exercise caution in developing any new AIS Symbology, considering the potential for increased confusion and the need for education.
   4. IHO and IMO involvement is essential for any symbology changes..
   5. MAtoN must have Physical AIS AtoN included.
   6. Any AIS Name must used the prefixed term ’MOBILE.........’
   7. AIS output power and elevation of transceiver must be considered and defined.
9. Filtering of Group A and B AMRD on Electronic Navigation Systems (ECDIS- RADAR etc)
   1. We must consider, along with IMO, the potential to integrate filter functions into Electronic Navigation equipment, that allow for Group A and B AMRD to be hidden from navigation displays.
10. Role of the Competent Authority (AtoN)
    1. Approval to use a MAtoN can only be given by the Competent Authority (AtoN).
    2. The Competent Authority (AtoN) or owner is responsible for monitoring MAtoN and updating information related to MAtoN.

**Review of Papers related to MAToN**

**ARM9-9.2 – WP WG1 Draft IALA Guideline on MAtoN (ARM8 Revised)**

The group noted the input paper, but on the basis of developing the above guiding principles has not made further amendment. It is proposed that the paper is forwarded to ARM10 as an input.

**ARM9 -9.2.1 – Input Paper – Mobile AtoN (Australia)**

The ARM committee acknowledged the input paper from Australia, and appreciated the concerns a for the future of MAtoN as raised within the paper.

Based on the feedback provided within this paper, and discussion during plenary, the committee agreed that WG 1 should develop guiding principles for any further work on MAtoN. The ARM committee agreed that the guiding principles shall be used to guide further development of the MAtoN concept.

The Guiding Principles have been shared with other IALA ENG and ENAV committees and PAP.

**ARM9 – 9.2.2 –Input paper proposal for MAtoN Symbol – Norwegian Coastal Administration**

WG1 reviewed the paper, noting the proposed colour scheme for a MAtoN and similarity to an Emergency Wreck Marking Buoy. The ARM committee has developed the principles above to guide further development of MAtoN, and it is recommended that this paper is forwarded to ARM10 and considered in any further design proposals.

The proposal by the Norwegian Coastal Administration, illustrates the linkages to the requirements of Article 8 of the Nairobi International Convention on the Removal of Wrecks, 2007.

The Secretariat is requested to forward this paper to ARM10.

**ARM9 – 9.2.3 – MAtoN Light character Trial Report (V1.0) General Lighthouse Authority Research and Development Department.**

WG1 reviewed the report of GRAD, noting the technical characteristics of the recently developed characteristic for a MAtoN. The committee agreed with that the proposed character was sufficiently unique to any other character and was therefore suitable for future use as the MAtoN character.

WG1 express their gratitude for the efforts of GRAD in developing this character.

WG1 proposes that the light character is an appropriate solution, and should be retained and included in any further work on MAtoN. The Secretariat is requested to forwarded to ARM10.

**Consolidated Guiding Principles**

1. Recommendation R-1016 requires prompt withdrawal and review, with the intent of amending the name for MAtoN to reflect a ‘means of marking a hazard’, not an aid to navigation.
2. The MAtoN is intended to assist both IALA and the State Party in compiling with the obligations of Article 8 of the Nairobi International Convention on the Removal of Wrecks, 2007,
3. MAtoN should only be used where the hazard needs to be marked to enhance situation awareness and assist navigation
4. The use cases for MAtoN require revision.
5. MAtoN characteristics must be unique, and consideration should be given to Norways proposal (IALA ARM9-9.2.2), and GRAD proposal (IALA ARM9-9.2.3)
6. MAtoN must have a means of automatically and consistently reporting its position
7. MAtoN must be physically attached to the hazard.
8. IALA does not support or encourage the use of any virtual MAtoN
9. Any Symbology must be approved through IHO and IMO.
10. The Competent Authority (AtoN) should be involved in approval, monitoring and recovery of MAtoN.