Input paper: [[1]](#footnote-2) VTS52-9.1.1

Input paper for the following Committee(s): check as appropriate Purpose of paper:

**□** ARM **□** ENG **□** PAP **□** Input

**□** ENAV **X** VTS **X** Information

Agenda item [[2]](#footnote-3) 9.1

Technical Domain / Task Number 2 …………………………………

Author(s) / Submitter(s) IALA World-Wide Academy

Update of R0119 on the implementation of VTS and G1150 on establishing, planning and implementing a VTS

# Summary

G1150 sets out the guidance for implementation of a VTS but is silent on making changes to or the discontinuation of a service once authorized. It is proposed that G1150 also includes advice that changes to an existing VTS or the discontinuation of an authorized VTS should normally be approved by the competent authority supported by appropriate justification such as a review of hazards/risks or establishment of alternative mitigation measures.

The Guideline provides comprehensive advice on establishing, planning and implementing a VTS but the situation is less clear as to guidance on possible approaches to take when changes are to be made to an existing VTS (reduction of capability such as a smaller area etc.) or, if the circumstances dictate, closing a VTS.

The general framework within the Guideline would be generally valid for such circumstances if supported by explanatory remarks in a new paragraph 6 (entitled post implementation review). This additional guidance may be of assistance when changes to or the discontinuation of an existing VTS are considered as, naturally, a Contracting Government would likely wish for reassurance that the volume of traffic or degree of risk no longer justifies a VTS (either in full or part). This would assist in avoiding the situation where a VTS could essentially be changed or discontinued without the involvement of the competent authority.

Arguably, the requirement of SOLAS V/12 is a two way obligations as the Contracting Government undertakes to establish VTS where 'in their opinion' the volume of traffic or degree of risk justifies it. If changes are required, either expansion or contraction of an established VTS, the opinion of the Contracting Government should be sought so that it can be changed if necessary.

Within edition 4 of recommendation R0119 – Establishment of a VTS, the phrase “or making changes to an existing vessel traffic service” at the end of the first paragraph of the second section “Recognising” was removed. This was originally included to address the issue of changes to or discontinuation of a VTS and it may be appropriate to reinstate this phrase in R0119.

In addition to the above changes, minor clarifications are also proposed.

## Related documents

VTS52-9.1.1.1 R0119 (V-119) The implementation of Vessel Traffic Services

VTS52-9.1.1.2 G1150 Establishing, Planning and Implementing a VTS

# Action requested of the Committee

The Committee is requested to consider the proposed amendments to IALA Recommendation R0119 and IALA Guideline G1150.
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