



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 Letter: 04/2007

UKHO ref: HA317/010/031-04 & HA317/004/058-04

Telephone:
(Chairman) +44 (0) 1823 337900 ext 3020
(Secretary) +44 (0) 1823 337900 ext 3656
Facsimile: +44 (0) 1823 325823
E-mail: peter.jones@ukho.gov.uk
andrew.coleman@ukho.gov.uk

To CSPCWG Members

Date 16 March 2007

Dear Colleagues,

Subject: Additional M-4 specifications for colour printing, deeper wrecks and positioning of chart seals; mangrove symbols – follow-up to Letter 02/2007.

We received 17 responses to Letter 02/2007 and thank everyone for their comments, which can be summarised as follows:

1. **Draft specification for colour printing.** Apart from some minor changes suggested by Finland, which we can incorporate, this draft was accepted by all respondents.
2. **Wrecks deeper than surrounding bathymetry.** 11 respondents were happy to accept the draft, but 6 had some concerns. These are discussed in more detail in Annex A, and a revised draft is submitted for consideration.
3. **Positioning of chart seals (crests) on adopted co-produced charts.** This draft was accepted by all respondents. Finland suggested a minor change, which we have included, and also asked 'what is the instruction concerning the IHO seal'. We believe that when the new paragraph is read in conjunction with the existing paragraphs, it is clear that the IHO seal is always positioned to the right.
4. **Mangrove symbol.** None of the respondents currently use the complex version of the mangrove symbol on modern charts (although it may still exist on some un-modernized charts).
5. No advice was supplied about any other HOs using the complex symbol.

Please consider the re-draft in Annex A and reply by **16 April 2007** only if you have further issues. I will then ask IHB to include all these draft specifications in the next appropriate IHO Circular Letter.

Yours sincerely,

Peter G.B. Jones,
Chairman

Draft additional paragraph B-416.3 (Wrecks in changeable areas).

6 out of the 17 respondents to CSPCWG Letter 02/2007 expressed reservations about the draft paragraph for charting wrecks deeper than the surrounding bathymetry.

1. Some of the reservations were concerned with survey methods for 're-examining' wrecks. It was suggested that we should add something like 'if the survey is carried out with multibeam equipment and side-scan sonar, the depth over the previously known wreck position should be obtained from the survey' (Denmark). However, there are two problems with this:
 - 1.1. Cartographers should not make judgements about whether multibeam is adequate to 're-examine' wrecks. This is a matter for surveyors to judge. At present, this will vary from nation to nation; UK surveyors have evidence that multibeam cannot be assumed to have found the least depth over a wreck. (This is why the K2 'swept' symbol must not be used for multibeam surveyed wrecks). We suggest therefore that the term 'specifically re-examined' (as suggested by Spain) allows for nations to apply their own national standards, without stating in the specification what method has been used.
 - 1.2. If the wreck has been covered by sediment, it will not be found by side-scan or multibeam. This makes it inappropriate to use the depth from the survey (which is the depth from surface to sea floor, not the depth from surface to wreck). In such cases, it would not be possible to have a depth over the wreck 'greater than the surrounding depths', which is the problem which this specification is intended to address.
2. Some respondents suggested that the phrase 'not the wreck depth' should be removed. This was inserted for clarity, to make absolutely clear what was meant by 'being in accordance with the surrounding depths'. We consider that this is still required, but accept that the short statement may itself have been confusing. We have therefore amended it to 'not the depth shown over the wreck'.
3. The discussions about the use of multibeam and side-scan sonar brought to our attention another problem. It was never intended that this paragraph should prevent the possibility of deleting wrecks the existence of which had been disproved by multibeam or side-scan sonar. This was because it was not made clear in the original version that this situation really only applies in areas where sediments may have covered the wreck. Elsewhere, if a wreck does not show up on a resurvey, it may be because it has been salvaged, completely broken up or otherwise no longer exists. In such cases, it would be for the surveyor to decide whether the wreck had been disproved and can be safely removed from charts. To avoid this possible misunderstanding, we propose to move the specification to B-416.3 (the section concerned with 'areas of continual change'), and insert cross references in appropriate places in B-422.
4. Germany proposed using the K31 'Foul' symbol. This would have the advantage of warning the user that some wreckage may exist that is no longer projecting above the sea floor and therefore not a danger to surface navigation. However, it is not strictly in accordance with the definition of a foul, ie 'remains of a wreck', as the wreck may still be complete. Further, if the sediments move again, and the wreck becomes exposed and possibly dangerous, the need to revert to a wreck symbol could be missed. The bathymetry is only likely to be changed if a new survey has been done, but we cannot be sure that all newly exposed wrecks would be found, particular if the survey is single beam, as they often are in port areas.
5. **In summary**, the revised draft for your consideration is:

B-416.3 Wrecks in changeable areas. In areas of mobile sediments which are frequently resurveyed, the wrecks in an area may not be specifically re-examined. In such cases, the details from the most recent wreck examination should be retained. If this results in the charted depth over a wreck being greater than the surrounding depths (because of the movement of sediments), the tint over the wreck symbol should be in accordance with the surrounding depths, not the depth shown over the wreck. The wreck should not be removed, as it may still exist and at a future time the sediments may move and the wreck be uncovered again. If there are numerous wrecks deeper than surrounding depths in navigationally significant areas, an explanatory note may be inserted.

(Note: A cross reference to this addition will be added at B-422g and B-422.7, 2nd bullet iv).