



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: 10/2008

UKHO ref: HA317/010/031-05

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 17 July 2008

Dear Colleagues,

Subject: CSPCWG4 Actions 32 - IHB Secondee tasks

At the 4th CSPCWG meeting in November 2007, Action 32 required the Chairman to include the following in a brief for an 'INT1 scoping study' for a potential IHB secondee:

- review whether MS have inappropriately allocated INT1 numbers to national symbols;
- possible removal of redundant numbers;
- ensure consistency of terms and descriptions with M-4.

Of the above, the first task is related to Action 25 (extract from CSPCWG4 record follows):

AU commented that some hydrographic offices introduce new numbers for national symbols, in their national versions of INT1, instead of alphabetical labels. The Secretary was requested to research IHO resolutions and documents to discover whether any written guidance exists, and to include a reminder in the next IHO CL on CSPCWG topics.

ACTION 25: Secretary to research guidance on use of numbers and letters in INT1 versions and draft a reminder to avoid using numbers for national symbols, for inclusion in next suitable IHO CL.

The guidance is M-4 B-151.1. The opportunity to include this in CL37/2008 was missed; it will be considered for the next appropriate IHO CL. There seems therefore little value in asking a potential IHB secondee to spend significant time researching around 60 national symbols booklets to see whether any MS have inappropriately allocated INT1 numbers to national symbols. If any such were found, it is difficult to see what CSPCWG could do, other than draw attention to M-4 B-151.1, which we plan to do anyway.

The second task is: 'possible removal of redundant numbers'. In fact, there are very few redundant numbers, ie E11, 12, F29, L13-15, Q60, 61 and some in section U. Some are already used for national symbols, which may lead, in due course, to international symbols being designed, as we continue our review of M-4. Also progressing low priority work items E4 'Symbols for vacant entries in INT 1' and E5 'Small craft symbols' may lead to further new symbols. In the meantime, removing vacant numbers would leave a gap in the number sequence which could potentially confuse users.

The third task is covered by Action 9 (extract from CSPCWG4 record follows):

ACTION 9: Secretary to conduct a scoping review of the extent to which official INT1s do not comply with the recommendations.

(These recommendations concern the requirement to ensure consistency between the terms and descriptions used in M-4 and its supplementary publications, especially INT1. This was partly the subject of CSPCWG Letter 07/2008, resulting in an amended draft of the CSPCWG procedures).

The Secretary has conducted such a scoping review, examining the terms and descriptions in the latest published INT1 (DE version) for sections H, I, J and part K, covering parts of M-4 which have been recently revised. The finding was that INT1 and M-4 are consistent in most cases. There are a few cases where the wording could be improved and made more consistent, although none of the differences are likely to confuse the chart user (the target group for INT1). The conclusion therefore is that there is no pressing need to conduct a full review. The Secretary and members of the INT1 subWG could be more robust in considering whether changes are needed to INT1 following publication of a revised section of M-4. There is therefore no need for the third task suggested for the potential IHB secondee.

I conclude, therefore, that there is no need to prepare work on INT1 for a potential IHB secondee. If you disagree with this conclusion, I would be grateful to receive your views by 11 September 2008. If you agree with my conclusion, there is no need to respond.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "A Heath-Coleman". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Andrew Heath-Coleman
Secretary