

Paper for Consideration by CSPCWG

INT1 subWG Report

| | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Submitted by: | Secretary |
| Executive Summary: | A report of the activities of the INT1 subWG since the 5 th CSPCWG meeting (November 2008) |
| Related Documents: | INT1. |
| Related Projects: | None |

Introduction / Background

The INT1 subWG consists of the producers of the three official INT1s (France, Germany and Spain) with the CSPCWG Secretary. The objective of the INT1subWG is stated in its Terms of Reference as:

To develop and maintain the three official language version of INT 1 'Symbols, Abbreviations, Terms used on Charts' (i.e. English, French and Spanish).

The full Terms of Reference are at Annex A. These have been amended by changing M-4 to S-4, but are otherwise unchanged from version 2.0. 23 November 2006

The current versions of INT1 are:

English (German produced): January 2008

Spanish: December 2007

French: 2006

Activity during the period since last CSPCWG meeting

The subWG has not met in the period. It has progressed subWG business by correspondence, mainly to progress actions allocated to it at by the CSPCWG at CSPCWG5. The progress on these actions is stated in Annex B.

The agreed procedures for maintaining INT1 versions include:

Navigationally significant changes (or corrections) should be made by NM (or NM Block). Such cases should be rare, and would be the subject to subWG consultation and be announced by IHO CL and displayed on the IHO website.

Germany has produced two block corrections for their version of INT1, for affecting INT 1 symbols L17 / L18 (page 43) and N13 / N14 (page 52). Reference: German Notice to Mariners (NfS)12/09 dated 20 March 2009. These are available to view in the INT1 section of the IHO website.

Germany consulted within the subWG before publishing these blocks. However, while Spain also published blocks for their version of INT1, France did not consider these amendments to be navigationally significant and so did not publish equivalent blocks.

In correspondence following this decision, it was decided that the following principle governing publication of NEs would also apply to NM blocks:

The decision to publish a new edition may be based on many factors, eg weight of outstanding correction, available resources, commercial needs balanced against user expectations. Therefore, the publishing of a new edition must remain at the discretion of the publishing office.

Action required of CSPCWG

The CSPCWG is invited to:

- a. note the report of the INT1subWG
- b. endorse the outcomes from the CSPCWG5 actions (see Annex B) and consequently agree that CSPCWG5 actions 2 and 27-30 can be closed.
- c. agree that CSPCWG5 Action 19 should be closed and a new action should be opened for the subWG to complete its review of significant differences in symbols in M-4 and the 3 official INT1s.
- d. advise the INT1 subWG whether a total list of topographic and hydrographic terms (from which individual nations could select any they wish to omit) would be useful and should be located somewhere in S-4.
- e. advise the INT1 subWG whether INT1 should include a reversed list of terms (ie English to French/Spanish/German).
- f. approve the continuing existence of the INT1 subWG.

TERMS OF REFERENCE
for the
INT 1 subWG of the
CHART STANDARDIZATION AND PAPER CHART W.G. (CSPCWG)

1. Objectives

To develop and maintain the three official language version of INT 1 ‘Symbols, Abbreviations, Terms used on Charts’ (i.e. English, French and Spanish).

2. Authority

The sub Working Group (subWG) is a subsidiary of CSPCWG and its work is subject to CSPCWG approval.

3. Procedures

- a. The subWG will conduct its business mainly by correspondence.
- b. The subWG will report to meetings of CSPCWG and will copy significant correspondence to all CSPCWG members, through the CSPCWG Secretary.
- c. The CSPCWG Chairman will review annually the outstanding issues and continuing need for the subWG.

4. Composition and Chairmanship

- a. Membership of the INT 1 subWG will consist of the French, German and Spanish CSPCWG members (as representatives of the Member States responsible for producing the three official language versions of INT 1) and the CSPCWG Secretary.
- b. There will be no Chairman. The CSPCWG Secretary will coordinate correspondence.

5. Tasks

- a. Liaise regarding the publication of new editions of INT 1.
- b. Liaise regarding the publication of updates via Notices to Mariners.
- c. Advise and make proposals to CSPCWG on policy for maintaining INT 1.
- d. Develop improvements in consistency between INT 1 versions and with S-4 (e.g. identify and seek to eliminate significant inconsistencies; work towards the inclusion of all INT symbols in each language version).
- e. Advise CSPCWG on implications to INT 1 of proposed changes for S-4.
- f. Assess vacant entries (CSPCWG Work Item E.4).
- g. Consider the potential for developments of INT 1 to meet users’ needs (e.g. as a digital publication), advising CSPCWG accordingly.
- h. Assist in the Quality Assurance of INT 1.

CSPCWG5 INT1 subWG ACTIONS

Action 2: INT1 producers to amend term for K31 to 'Foul ground, not dangerous to surface navigation, but to be avoided by vessels anchoring, trawling, etc (eg remains of wreck, cleared platform)' at next new edition of INT1.

Context: The definition in the current editions of INT1 is not exactly as agreed in the CSPCWG4 record, particularly in missing the example of a cleared platform, which was suggested to make more explicit that the term 'foul' may apply to something other than a dispersed wreck.

Outcome:

All members of the subWG have noted this amendment for the next editions of INT1. CSPCWG5 Action 2 can be closed.

Action 19: The INT1 subWG to examine which chart symbols in M-4 and the three official INT1s are significantly different and seek ways of reducing the differences.

Context: In a WG discussion about the proposed 'symbol library', the meeting agreed that in view of the split vote on the use of M-4 as a symbol library, and that there is little impact for chart users, that option 4 (the status quo) would be retained. For future consideration, paper chart symbols could be included in an S-100 portrayal register, but not to be progressed before the revision of M-4 is completed.

There may be some symbols where the differences between M-4 and the 3 INT1s are significantly different. The INT1 subWG were invited to examine this and seek ways of reducing the differences.

Outcome: The members of the subWG have undertaken to each check a section of INT1, comparing the 4 symbols (ie in M-4 and each of the 3 official INT1s) and make a list of any where they consider the difference in appearance is 'significant'.

Spain has checked section A to I

France will check sections J to P

Germany will check sections Q to U.

All will forward the outcomes of their checks to the secretary, who will produce a consolidated list for further consideration by the subWG members.

It is suggested that CSPCWG5 Action 19 should be closed and a new action should be opened for the subWG to complete its review of significant differences in symbols in M-4 and the 3 official INT1s.

Action 27: INT1 subWG to consider:

- 1. how to highlight the INT abbreviations within section V.**
- 2. whether to rearrange section letters consequent on deletion of G, O and W.**

Context: The meeting agreed that it would be helpful to highlight (eg by bold) the INT abbreviations within Section V of INT1 (as suggested by ES).

Outcomes:

1. The INT1 producers have agreed that INT abbreviations will be highlighted by the use of bold text in the next editions. An explanatory note '**Internationally approved abbreviations (based on English language) are shown in bold text**' will be added, as it seems useful to add the point about the English language, as otherwise the abbreviations may seem odd, for example 'B' for 'Negro' in Spanish. Column headings similar to the French version (in the national language, of course) will also be included with a column of obsolescent abbreviations, if appropriate.

2. The subWG have agreed that Sections G and O should be omitted, with a note on the contents page stating '**Not currently used**'. Subsequent sections will remain with existing letters, up to Section U (if this section is still required, see CSPCWG6-08.6A). After 'U' on the contents page there will be two unlettered entries, under the heading '**ALPHABETICAL INDEXES**':

Index of Abbreviations (National & International)

General Index/Translation of Terms

These two indexes will then consist of: existing V and W merged and existing G, O and X merged.

Action 28: WG members to study their own publications to see if clarifications of the term 'recommended' are, or could be, expressed in their publications and advise the rest of the WG (through the Secretary) of their findings, by end February 2009.

Action 29: INT1 subWG to consider inputs regarding the term 'recommended' from WG members and consider further for the next round of INT1 new editions.

Context: The meeting could not agree suitable wording for INT1 to draw attention to the fact that some or all recommended tracks and routing measures are not recommended by the charting authority. This is partly because of different organizational situations of the various HOs. Also, there was some doubt as to whether such wording is useful, or would be better given within other publications (such as Annual Notices to Mariners, The Mariner's Handbook). WG members were invited to study their own publications to see if such clarifications are, or could be, expressed in their publications and advise the rest of the WG of their findings.

Outcome: No WG members sent any findings from Action 28. Consequently, there is no action for the subWG. The subWG members decided that this topic should be abandoned. It is for individual HOs to notify their users of the particular application of 'recommended' in the context of their charts, if and how they think appropriate.

Action 30: INT1 subWG to review FR's suggested list of terms and develop the idea of a glossary/index in lieu of G & O, including how to deal with vacant sections G, O and W.

Context: The meeting agreed that sections G & O can be removed from INT1, and instead be replaced by entries in the Index. Terms that have no other place in INT1 will simply have no cross reference location.

Outcome:

The subWG considered the following questions arising from FR's suggestions.

1. Do we agree that the lists can be different in each version of INT1?

HOs seeking to derive an INT1 from one of the official versions would find it helpful if the lists are as similar as possible (although it makes no difference to the chart user). A total list (from which individual nations could select any they wish to omit) would be useful. Perhaps such a list could eventually be located somewhere in S-4. The subWG would welcome CSPCWG views.

2. Is a reversed list (ie English to French/Spanish/German) necessary?

A reversed list would be useful, both for HOs and chart users. However, it is more important that sections A to U are consistent for INT symbols, abbreviations and terms used for the three official INT1s. It is less important for the introduction, contents page and indexes. We should not insist.

3. Should the new list be called 'Index/Glossary' or 'Index/Translation of terms' or something else?

The subWG has agreed that the list should be called '**General Index/Translation of Terms**'.

4. Does the new index need to have a section letter (ie X), or is that unnecessary?

The subWG has agreed that a letter is unnecessary.