

**7th CSPCWG MEETING**  
**Simon's Town, South Africa 23-26 November 2010**

**Paper for Consideration by CSPCWG**

**Symbol for Diving Prohibited – Some History**

<b>Submitted by:</b>	Secretary
<b>Executive Summary:</b>	Sweden has proposed (CSPCWG7-08.8A) a symbol for 'diving prohibited'. This symbol has been previously proposed and discussed by CSPCWG.
<b>Related Documents:</b>	S-4, INT1, CSPCWG Letters 04, 10 and 13 of 2004
<b>Related Projects:</b>	None

### Introduction / Background

This symbol was originally proposed by Denmark, along with the wind turbine symbol (a variation of which was adopted), several symbols for 'inadvisable' activities (which were rejected) and the 'Entry Prohibited' symbol (which was adopted). The submission was originally to CSC in 1999 and then again to CHRIS15 in 2003 (CHRIS15-5.6A refers). CHRIS required CSPCWG to consider the submission, as Work Plan item D.4. This was progressed through correspondence. CSPCWG letters 04, 10 and 13/2004 provide summaries.

### Analysis / Discussion

As only a few CSPCWG members from 2004 are still involved with CSPCWG, it might be helpful to supply some background information about the earlier discussions. The following extracts from these letters serve to explain what happened with regard to the proposed 'diving prohibited' symbol.

#### **Extracts from CSPCWG Letter 10/04 Subject: New symbols for activities prohibited or "not advisable" (further to CL 04/2004):**

2. DIVING PROHIBITED. A majority of members agreed that such a symbol would be useful. However, several expressed the view that the proposed symbol  is too complex (e.g. for ease of hand drawing for NMs, for display in ECDIS systems) and may tend to fill in when reduced to a suitable chart size of about 4mm. France offered an alternative symbol , which is possibly better but probably still fails the requirements above. I suggest therefore that Denmark should develop an improved, simpler, symbol for consideration. For reasons stated at 5 below, the revised symbol should only have a single stroke.

5. SYMBOL STYLES. It was generally felt that the difference between *X* and *I* would not intuitively be recognised by chart users. Both would be seen as implying a restriction or prohibition. S-52 uses the single stroke (*I*) for the sake of simplicity and to cover activities prohibited, restricted or to be avoided. It is therefore recommended that, for consistency, any future prohibition symbols designed for paper charts (including diving prohibited, as above) should use only a single stroke. Members may wish to comment on whether the existing anchoring and fishing prohibited symbols should be amended accordingly (with the crossed out version (*X*) becoming obsolescent). Amendments would be required to M-4 and INT 1.

#### **Extract from subsequent Letter 13/04:**

2. Support for a simplified "Diving Prohibited" symbol was evenly divided. As there are clearly a number of HOs who have a use for such a symbol, if a sufficiently simple

and intuitive symbol can be developed, I believe it is worth progressing. We had earlier received a suggestion from France, and now a further suggestion from Colombia, both of which we have forwarded to Denmark. We understand that Germany has also forwarded one directly.

It does not appear that DK ever submitted a simplified symbol, and we never saw the DE suggestion. This is the CO suggestion (which was rejected by CSPCWG as not intuitive) and the FR symbol:

CO:  FR: 

### Conclusions

There was certainly support for the idea of a diving prohibited symbol, and one is fairly widely used within the Baltic countries, plus a different one used by France.

Questions remaining to resolve include:

1. Did DK or DE ever design a simpler symbol or research alternative symbols from other sources?
2. Is it necessary for the symbol to be simpler especially noting the need for an equivalent S52 version? (Note: it seems unlikely that it would need to be inserted as a hand correction on paper charts, as unlikely to be the subject of NM.)
3. If not, is the existing French or Swedish version preferred?
4. Should it be crossed through with a single stroke? (Note: some countries already use this to mean 'diving inadvisable', although this was rejected as an INT symbol).

### Action required of CSPCWG

The CSPCWG is invited to discuss the possible benefit and implementation of the proposal.