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# Summary

The attached is the report of IMO Correspondence Group on AIS-AtoN to NAV58.

## Purpose of the document

The purpose of this document is to inform of the report to the ANM members and to make use the report as a reference for the revision of IALA Recommendation O-143 and Guideline 1081.

# Background

Japan proposed the development of new symbols for AIS-AtoN at MSC86 as a new work item of NAV and MSC approved the proposal. At NAV56 Japan proposed some guidance for the development of new symbols with examples of new symbols, however many members raised their concerns that there was no discussion at IMO regarding AIS-AtoN, especially virtual AIS-AtoN and IMO policy on the use of AIS-AtoN was needed before the development of new symbols. Receiving the result of NAV56, Japan and the United States proposed expansion of the scope of work to include the development of policy at MSC88 and MSC again approved it. At NAV57, Japan proposed establishment of Correspondence Group in order to develop the policy and report the result at NAV58. Consequently, the development of new symbols will be carried out from NAV58 to 59 after the policy completed. NAV approved the establishment of the Correspondence Group under the coordination of Japan.

# discussion

## Definition

At the first stage of the Correspondence Group work, there were two opinions on the definition of AIS-AtoN. The one is to use the IALA Recommendation A-126 which defines AIS-AtoN as transmitting Message 21 “AtoN report” of ITU-R M.1371 that uses the IALA Maritime Buoyage System for the type of AtoN. The other is to use IALA Recommendation O-143 which defines virtual AtoN as a digital information object and includes line, area and objects information into virtual AtoN. For AIS-AtoN, to transfer line, area or object information needs to use Application Specific Message (former called “binary message”) which is defined by SN.1/Circ. 289. Many members supported the later one though, considering that the Application Specific Message is still under the discussion of the IMO Correspondence Group on e-navigation, the Group decided to define AIS-AtoN as transmitting Message 21 only.

Regarding a name of “real AIS-AtoN” that is an AIS transmitter located on a AtoN, the Group agreed to change the name to “physical AIS AtoN” since “virtual AIS-AtoN” that has no physical AtoN existing is “real” information object.

There were also different opinions regarding how to describe the implementation ways of AIS-AtoN on the IMO policy. The IALA Recommendation A-126 mentioned three implementation ways of AIS-AtoN, “physical (before “real”)” “synthetic” and “virtual”. There were three opinions.

* To describe all implementation ways, since mariner should know the difference of AIS-AtoN.
* To describe only “physical” and “virtual”. Since “synthetic” AIS-AtoN has physically existing AtoN, there is no difference between “physical” and “synthetic” from mariner’s view. The policy should be “goal-based”.
* Not to describe any implementation way. Because it opens an area for development of future AIS-AtoN.

The Group could not decide the description of implementation ways due to the time remaining. Therefore the decision will be made at NAV Sub-Committee.

## Application

The AIS-AtoN is relatively new technology and there are some limitations, especially portrayal of AIS-AtoN information. The Group agreed that it is highly important that mariners know how to interpret, understand and use AIS-AtoN before any decision of establishment or deployment is made as general principle.

Regarding application of virtual AIS-AtoN, there were two applications, temporary and permanent. However the Group agreed that the permanent application is not recommended since permanent objects should be marked in ENCs, paper chart and other nautical publications.

## New symbols

Denmark proposed inclusion of new symbols into the policy since the IEC carried out a regular maintenance of IEC 62288 that defined navigational related symbols with the target completion date of January 2013 and it was preferable to harmonize the work of the Group with the IEC work. However the Group decided that since the TOR of the Group was develop a draft policy only and the time was too short to consider new symbols, not include the proposed new symbols into the draft policy but introduce it as information only.

# Action requested of the Committee

The ANM Committee is invited to note the attached document and decide as appropriate.