

**4th CSPCWG MEETING
Monaco, 13-15 November 2007**

Paper for Consideration by CSPCWG

Proposed removal of unused numbers in official INT1s

| | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Submitted by: | AU |
| Executive Summary: | The great work of the INT1 SubWg has some INT1 numbers no longer being used and there are numerous numbers allocated that do not have abbreviations or symbols. As many member states produce national INT1s, should the CSPCWG consider producing a guidance document on issues to be considered in their publication. |
| Related Documents: | Chart Specifications of the IHO (M-4) Official INT1s |
| Related Projects: | CSPCWG task E – maintenance of M-4 supplementary publications INT1, INT2 and INT3. CSPCWG4-07B CSPCWG principles |

Introduction / Background

The INT1 SubWg to CSPCWG has undertaken a very worthwhile task to make all three official INT1s more consistent. This review has resulted in some allocated INT1 numbers no longer being used. There are also numerous existing published numbers without any abbreviation or symbol and there have been proposals to remove certain whole sections from the official INT1s. As a general tidy up, is it now time to remove all such useless numbers?

Analysis / Discussion

As we know, both M-4 section numbers and INT1 numbers are used in other IHO publications, especially S-52, S-57 and S-100. As few mariners even know of the existence of M-4, INT1 numbering has little if any impact on mariners. However for IHO member states producing navigational products, M-4 in particular should be one of most commonly used publications for chart compilation. It appears to be common practice for nautical cartographers to use INT1 as a shortcut to M-4 and as a quick reference guide to the various symbols available for charting.

Some nations use the INT1 numbering scheme for national symbols, but there is no need for this as lower case alphabetical labels have been assigned for this very purpose at the end of each section (if required).

There are also some obsolete symbols within INT1. How long should such symbols be published in the official INT1s? Should we wait until every chart is updated to the new symbols before removing obsolete symbols?

Many member states publish their own INT1, or something very similar. Should the CSPCWG prepare a guidance document on producing such publications. S-65 is an example of a guidance document for those member states starting to get involved in ENC's for the first time. Something similar could be developed for INT1s. The CSPCWG is not looking for new work items, but it is part of our responsibility to at least remind member states of the numbering scheme used for INT1 and how it relates back to M-4. The INT1 SubWg has worked out various rules and procedures in the review of the official INT1s. If these rules and procedures were documented, they may form the basis of a guidance document for other member states. Even if the preparation of a guidance document isn't agreed to, the recording of the INT1 SubWg procedures will be useful for any future reviews carried out in the distant future. The TSMAD working group is losing its older members, especially those who compiled the original 'Use of the Object Catalogue'. When this document has to be reviewed, revised and reformatted to be aligned with the new ISO standards, the fundamental rules and procedures used in its original production and reviews will be extremely important. We should learn from previous experience.

As a further tidy up to INT1, it is suggested that all redundant reference numbers be removed, but be retained by CSPCWG in case we ever need to reference back to their previous use (if any). This will give CSPCWG a clean sheet for INT1 so to speak. If these numbers are ever entered into a database or IHO register, there will need to be rules established about whether numbers can in fact be re-used or not. Again TSMAD has considered this for its new feature data dictionary register for hydrographic features, and attribute values for example, will not be re-used which will provide a history of previous editions of the standard. It is not until a database is adopted that this becomes more important.

Conclusions

A tidy-up of the official INT1 numbering appears to be timely as would be a reminder to all member states about how the INT1 numbers are allocated and that the CSPCWG controls the use of these numbers.

Recommendations

1. That the CSPCWG issue an IHO Circular Letter to all MS reminding them that the control and allocation of INT1 numbers lies with our WG;
2. That all redundant INT1 numbers be removed from the official INT1s;
3. That the official CSPCWG retain a permanent record of all known uses of redundant INT1 numbers;
4. That the CSPCWG produce internal procedures on the rules and procedures used in the review of the consistency check of the official INT1s; and
5. That the CSPCWG consider producing a guidance document for member states producing national INT1s.

Justification and Impacts

It is important that IHO member states do not issue INT1 numbering contrary to the official INT1s.

Action required of CSPCWG

The CSPCWG is invited to consider the above recommendations.