



CHART STANDARDIZATION & PAPER CHART WORKING GROUP (CSPCWG)

[A Working Group of the Committee on Hydrographic Requirements for Information Systems – CHRIS]

Chairman: Peter JONES
Secretary: Andrew HEATH-COLEMAN

UK Hydrographic Office
Admiralty Way, Taunton, Somerset
TA1 2DN, United Kingdom

CSPCWG Circular Letter: 10/2004

UKHO ref: HA317/010/031-01 & HA405/005/025-01

Telephone:
(Chairman) +44 (0)1823 723343
(Secretary) +44 (0) 1823 337900 x 3656
Facsimile: +44 (0)1823 325823
E-mail: peter.jones@ukho.gov.uk
andrew.coleman@ukho.gov.uk




To CSPCWG Members

Date 19 May 2004

Dear Colleagues,

Subject: New symbols for activities prohibited or “not advisable” (further to CL 04/2004)



We received 12 responses to Denmark’s proposals from CSPCWG members, plus a response from Norway (via Denmark) and a response from the C&SMWG. Our WG practice of using “reply to all” on email correspondence seems to be working well, so you will have already read most of the views expressed. This letter therefore attempts to summarise the views, rather than report them in full, and to suggest a way forward on each point.

1. ENTRY PROHIBITED. The symbol with the diagonal line  received little support, and would cause confusion with a similar symbol with a different meaning in WECDIS (Warship ECDIS). The Danish proposal  was preferred by a majority, although some suggested a small modification to make it more like the road symbol (i.e. by “squaring” the ends of the white bar and making it slightly shorter). I believe this is a helpful suggestion, which will also make it more similar to a mirror image of the S-52 symbol. A 3mm diameter seems about right, in line with other circle symbols (e.g. IF 10, IN 12.8, appropriately a little bigger than IN 48). The proposed symbol would appear as: 

Netherlands pointed out that the road symbol strictly means “No entry” *from a particular direction*. To make an area completely prohibited on land means that all access roads need a “No entry” sign. This will work well on a chart, so that the symbol could be used within the line IN2.2 to show entry prohibited from a particular direction (e.g. when quays must be approached by passing on one side of an island, and exiting on the opposite side; effectively a one way route). If the symbol is shown within an area, or the area is completely enclosed by the line symbol, then that would mean that no vessels are allowed in the area.

It would rarely be necessary to combine with another line symbol, as when entry is prohibited, then all other activities are effectively prohibited. Occasionally, it may be necessary to show why entry is prohibited (e.g. the area is an ESSA of some kind), in which case it would be preferable to show that aspect within the area, rather than in the line.

M-4 B-439.3 and INT 1 IN 2.2 and 31 will need amendment.


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.
3. **SEABED OPERATIONS PROHIBITED.** There were almost equally divided views on whether this symbol is useful. There was also considerable confusion over its definition. Does it mean:
 - a. dredging prohibited, as implied by the grab symbol, or
 - b. does it cover other seabed activities (such as drilling, mineral extraction) but not including anchoring and trawling which are already covered by existing symbols, or
 - c. is it intended to cover all seabed activities so that the existing anchoring and fishing prohibited symbols would be unnecessary in areas marked with the new symbol?

There were also the valid points that:

- seabed activities (other than anchoring) are not part of *navigation*, and therefore it is not a requirement to show such prohibitions on charts;
- the charting of cables and pipelines in themselves indicate to the chart user that seabed activities should be avoided in the vicinity, so additional symbols are just clutter.

In view of the ambiguity of the proposed symbol, the less than clear definition and doubts expressed about its usefulness, the conclusion is that this symbol should not be adopted for use on International charts. The issue can be reconsidered if a less ambiguous symbol is proposed, with a better definition (preferably embracing the numerous related S-57 RESTRN attribute value definitions).

4. **ACTIVITIES NOT ADVISABLE.** There was almost no support for the proposed symbols. Furthermore, members generally felt that it is not the business of charts to carry advice of this nature, which could lead to liability issues for areas where no advice is given. Restrictions and prohibitions can be charted where such regulation is mandated by an appropriate authority (such as IMO or a government agency). Otherwise, the chart should be limited to giving details of the actual danger (e.g. Explosives Munitions Dumping Ground).
5. **SYMBOL STYLES.** It was generally felt that the difference between *X* and */* would not intuitively be recognised by chart users. Both would be seen as implying a restriction or prohibition. S-52 uses the single stroke (*/*) 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.
6. **SYMBOLS FOR DANGEROUS AREAS.** Very few members commented on the suggestion to develop symbols for such areas as Minefields, Former Mined Areas, Dumping Grounds (for various hazardous materials). Those that did were divided equally, but there does not appear to be a great desire to pursue this issue at present.
7. **INTERNATIONAL SIGN CONVENTIONS.** Although there is no support to change existing symbols to reflect international conventions, several suggested that these conventions should be considered for future new symbols. Therefore, if it is decided in the future to progress symbols for the dangerous areas above, for example, logically they could be shown in triangles (consistent with our existing precautionary area symbol), with an international symbol inside if available (e.g. example the radiation danger symbol could be used for radioactive waste dumping grounds).
8. In conclusion, your comments would be welcome, in particular:

- a. Do you now support the proposed “Entry Prohibited” symbol, as modified:  ?
- b. Please provide any suggestions to simplify the “Diving Prohibited” symbol to Denmark.
- c. Do you agree to not pursue the proposed “Seabed Operations Prohibited” symbol.
- d. Do you agree to not pursue the proposed “Activities Inadvisable” symbols?
- e. Should the existing anchoring and fishing prohibited symbols be modified to a single stroke, to agree with S-52?
- f. Do you wish to add developing symbols for Dangerous Areas to the CSPCWG work programme?

I appreciate that this is a lengthy letter covering many issues. Nevertheless, in order to keep things moving forward, I respectfully ask for your **response by 15 June 2004**.

Yours sincerely,



Peter G.B. Jones,
Chairman