**Marine Harbour Infrastructure (S-130)**

Subject: Marine Harbour Infrastructure (S-130) Scoping Meeting

Date: 25 August 2020 (revised 7 September 2010)

Forum: GoToMeeting sponsored by IHO

Attendees: Jens Schroeder-Furstenberg (BSH) (Chair)

Yoshitsugu Atsumi (JHOD)

Mr. Michihiro (JHOD)

Shwu-Jing Chang (NTOU)

Hyunsoo Choi (KRISO)

Yves Guillam (IHO)

Allan Idd Jensen (DGA)

Simon Vammen (DGA)

Michael Kushla (NGA)

Thomas Loeper (NOAA)

Tina Perry (NOAA)

Raphael Malyankar (Portolan Services)

Eivind Mong (CHS)

Charline Gillard (CHS)

Svein Skjaeveland (PRIMAR)

Ben van Scherpenzeel (IHMA)

Stefan Engstrom (FTA)

Wilfred den Toom (Netherlands)

Michael Bergmanm (Bergmann Marine)

**General**

Ben van Scherpenzeel (IMHA) stated the industry is exerting pressure for this type of information (PIM/S-130). The close relation with NIPWG and IHMA Port Information Manual works well for a common view. Harbormasters would have to contribute information not available to the Hydrographic Offices. The IHMA is pleased with the state of development of S-130.

Shwu-Jing Chang (NTOU) expressed concern with how to manage both locations (PIMS-130???) and how it would be added to the spreadsheet.

**Spreadsheet Scoping Discussion**

Currently about 800 lines of text in the S-130 spreadsheet.

The continued discussion centered around whether the Features/Attributes listed in the spreadsheet should be included or not. It is not important to have all information described in full detail at this time. That is a problem for later discussions.

The group continued with a line by line review of the Features/Attributes listed in the spreadsheet

1. Port Area:
   1. General layout-Simple attribute or complex attribute?
   2. Category of Harbor Attribution-List or make a general statement?
   3. Applicability of UNLOCODE and possible replacement of other IDs by the UNLOCODE.
   4. Load line zones--Complex attribute.
   5. ISPS level/MARSEC level?
   6. Weather risks—Some ports.
   7. Limiting conditions (depths/winds/waves/visibility). Is this a comprehensive list? Also pilot boarding location may be different from port basin. Which is better—attribute or text?
   8. Principal marks—Attribute or text?
   9. Time zone—Attribute (same as load line)?
   10. What is the difference between “port area” and “harbor area?” Do we expand “port area” from S-101 to “harbor area?” This is for future discussion but keep both for now.

Check S-32—both terms are in there.

1. Social/Political items—Basic information is provided.
2. Port Section Area—Could be basin, turning area, entrance, etc. Subsection of the port.
3. Ship Report—Attribute (text) or value? Refer to S-127.
4. Terminal—each facility has its own unique UNLOCODE.
5. Category of Berth Location—Harbormaster information.
6. Berth position—Provided by IHMA PIM.
7. Berth length availability—Lengthened by dolphins. May be shortened by other reasons.
8. Category of Mooring Facilities.
9. Pilot Boarding Places—Refer to S-127.
10. Waterways—Refer to S-127.
11. Places/Areas of Refuge—Is this item appropriate (in S-127?). Is this part of the port or a stand-alone item? Are these inside the port? Is it a harbor unto itself?

It is not really infrastructure. Remove from S-130 and place in S-127. Can include as a Boolean item (yes/no) in S-130.

1. Dock Area (lines 591-596)—Leave in S-101.
2. Weather (S-401), VTS (S-127), UKC (S-129), Nature of Bottom (S-101), and Passage Planning Information (S-127) are covered in other standards are should not be part of S-130.
3. Reports (line 598)—Not part of S-130.
4. Anchorage Area (line 604) (S-101)—Not part of S-130. Only add what is relevant to us.
5. Harbor Facilities (line 636 (S-101)—What should we add, if anything. Probably not relevant. Ben states that ownership belongs to the Terminal, not the Port Authority.
6. Pontoon (line 745) (S-101)—Keep this but add specific harbor infrastructure information.
7. Environmental Emergency Instructions—Depends. Make as a Feature. We could add contact information or a note saying information can be found at Broadcast Information.

**Closing Comments**

Should we be concerned with autonomous shipping? The ships require a lot more information. Should we discuss it here? Eivind Mong (CHS) feels it is too early to consider this. The IMO is still working on a legal framework. No further work on information for autonomous shipping should be considered at this time.