



CHART STANDARDIZATION & PAPER CHART WORKING GROUP (CSPCWG)

[A Working Group of the Hydrographic Services and Standards Committee (HSSC)]

Chairman: Peter JONES
Secretary: Andrew HEATH-COLEMAN

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

CSPCWG Letter: 11/2012

UKHO ref: HA317/010/031-09

Telephone:
(Chairman) +44 (0) 1823 337900 ext 5035
(Secretary) +44 (0) 1823 337900 ext 3656
Facsimile: +44 (0) 1823 325823
E-mail: peter.jone@ukho.gov.uk
andrew.coleman@ukho.gov.uk

To CSPCWG Members

Date 13 August 2012

Dear Colleagues,

Subject: Actions arising from 8th CSPCWG meeting - Group 1 –follow-up to Letter 06/12

Thank you to the 21 WG members who responded to WG Letter 06/2012. As usual, I have consolidated the responses, including all the comments, at Annex A. As you will see from the 'Yes' columns in the table, there was a good consensus agreeing with the proposed changes. Even the few 'No' responses were concerned with detail, rather than rejecting the entire drafts.

I have responded to the comments in red and adjusted the text as appropriate accordingly. As there was a good consensus and the changes are comparatively minor, I judge there is no need for a further round of discussions.

Action 7 will now be referred to HDWG.

Actions 10 and 11: I consider these to be clarifications of the existing guidance and not necessary to refer to MS. We will include in the next new edition of S-4 (4.4.0).

Action 17: this is new guidance on a new subject and must be referred to MS. I will wait the conclusions from other outstanding CSPCWG8 actions before preparing for MS approval.

Action 21: Already included as a clarification in S-4 Edition 4.3.0, as this was agreed at CSPCWG8 (see Action 21 statement).

There is no need to respond to this letter; however if you wish to comment further, please do so by 10 September.

Yours sincerely,

Peter Jones, Chairman

CSPCWG8 ACTIONS 7, 10, 11, 17 and 21

Consolidated Response Form

CSPCWG8 Action No	Question	Yes	No
7	Do you agree with the proposed revised definition ‘1’ for a nautical chart?	AU, BR, CA, CL, DE, DK, ES, FI, FR, GR, IT, JP, KR, NL, NO, NZ, SE, UA, UK, US, ZA	AU
10	Do you agree with the proposed changes to the 3rd paragraph of B-447.6?	AU, BR, CA, CL, DE, DK, ES, FI, FR, GR, IT, JP, KR, NL, NO, NZ, SE, UA, UK, US, ZA	
11	Do you agree with the proposed changes to B-445.5c and B-445.6?	AU, BR, CA, CL, DE, DK, ES, FI, FR, GR, IT, JP, KR, NL, NO, NZ, SE, UA, UK, US, ZA	
17	a. Do you agree with the proposed new section B-417.8?	AU, BR, CA, CL, DE, DK, ES, FI, FR, GR, IT, JP, KR, NL, NO, NZ, SE, UA, UK, US, ZA	
	b. Do you agree that B-417.8 is the best location in S-4?	AU, BR, CA, CL, DE, DK, ES, FI, FR, GR, IT, JP, KR, NL, NO, NZ, SE, UA, UK, US, ZA	
21	a. Do you agree with the proposed new paragraph to be added to B-448.4?	BR, CA, CL, DE, DK, ES, FI, FR, GR, IT, JP, KR, NL, NO, SE, UA, UK, US, ZA	AU, NZ
	b. Do you agree with the proposed change to B-422.9?	BR, CA, CL, DE, DK, ES, FI, FR, GR, IT, JP, KR, NL, NO, NZ, SE, UA, UK, US, ZA	

Comments:

AUSTRALIA

Action 7: While AU agrees that the definition requires modernisation, we consider that definitions contained in the Hydrographic Dictionary should be as concise as possible. Inclusion of phrases such as “for example” (which AU agrees is required if the examples are to be retained), while providing an abbreviated list of what may be on a nautical chart, may not value add to the definition as the statement is open ended (i.e. does not limit what may be on a nautical chart) and, as has been identified, may in future result in the definition being out of date. Additionally, AU considers that definitions should be restricted to “what the term means” without specifying content, which is the domain of the Product Specification (in this case S-4). AU therefore suggests that this part of the definition could be removed, such that the revised definition reads:

A CHART specifically designed to meet the requirements of MARINE NAVIGATION. **May be a paper chart, ELECTRONIC NAVIGATIONAL CHART (ENC) or RASTER NAVIGATIONAL CHART (RNC).** Also called marine chart, hydrographic chart, or simply CHART.

NOTE: Red text is additional text currently being discussed by HDWG and IHB as a result of IHO Member State comments received from IHO Circular Letter 11/2012. Text in capitals denotes terms requiring hyperlinks.

If the examples of nautical chart content are to be retained in the definition, AU would like to know the reasoning behind this. One opinion in our office is that if the examples of nautical chart content are removed, the definition may then be interpreted such that a Mercator plotting sheet satisfies the definition (general opinion in our office is that this would not be the case). If

CSPCWG determines that the examples should be retained, then AU has no issues with the proposed revised wording.

Chairman: The comment you make about not including examples is interesting as it could be generically applied to many definitions within S-32. Perhaps this principle needs to be raised with HDWG for discussion, before making changes to individual definitions.

The phrase ‘requirements of marine navigation’ implies that a nautical chart must be more than just a plotting sheet. Of course, this discussion reopens the unresolved issue of what ‘minimum content’ is required to constitute a nautical chart. This was originally discussed at CSPCWG1 and again at CSPCWG7, with the conclusion not to progress a detailed guide at present. With the publication of B-100.4 elaborating the purpose of a nautical chart, it may now be time to add a paragraph about the content, therefore allowing the S-32 definition to be reduced in due course? I will add to the CSPCWG9 agenda.

Meanwhile, in view of the vote from WG members, we should go ahead and offer the suggested definition, with examples, to HDWG for consideration. The sentence about ENC and RNCs would, of course, be added.

Action 11: Editorial correction: Amend last sentence before symbol L3 to read (amendment in red):

On the largest scale charts (if space permits), these safety zones must be shown by the magenta general maritime limit for restricted areas (N2.1).

Suggest removing the word “vessel” from the first sentence of the sample chart note (after (FPSO)) to be consistent with syntax in B-445.5(c) – “FPSO vessel” is not used in this clause.

Chairman: Agree to both suggestions.

Action 17: Suggest amend first paragraph as follows:

As a result of some disasters, eg earthquakes, tsunamis, hurricanes, it is possible that large areas of seafloor have moved and/or become cluttered with dangerous obstructions. Emergency surveys may be conducted to cover essential shipping routes and inside harbours. Outside these surveys, all existing charted bathymetric detail may now be considered suspect, however good the previous surveys may have been. In such cases, the limits of the emergency surveys may usefully be indicated on charts by a magenta dotted line. As this is not an INT1 symbol, an explanation should always be added to the chart, along the line, on the side of the new survey[?], eg:

The example should be a single line with the text placed along the line. I have suggested placing the text along the side of the line where the new survey exists, as I think this is more intuitive, but this is open to discussion.

Chairman: I accept these minor changes will improve the clarity of the guidance. However, we will amend the 3rd sentence to ‘...much of the existing charted detail...’ (as it may apply to more than bathymetry). We will amend the last line too: ‘...(eg ‘Limit of survey after 2011 earthquake’) along the inside of the limit (see B-439.6), or for small areas within or adjacent to it, eg:’

Second paragraph: This paragraph gives the impression that it is mandatory to include grey tint in the area of the after disaster survey on the source or ZOC diagram (is this the intent?). Suggest re-wording slightly. Also, the sentence regarding use of other colour tints and reference to B-293.8 seems a bit disjointed. Finally, for ZOC, the ZOC value applies to the overall quality of the bathymetric data as charted, not to “the surveys”. AU suggests the second paragraph be re-worded as follows:

If the limits are depicted on the chart alone, it may be difficult to identify which side of the limit the newly surveyed area is. It may therefore be useful to highlight the area on the **Source** or **ZOC diagram**, with a grey tint (see B-293.8 and B-297.2) and explanatory note. On ZOC diagrams, the

areas of bathymetry outside the re-surveyed area must be reclassified; usually category ‘D’ will be appropriate, as large depth anomalies and new obstructions may now be expected.

Chairman: I think your suggestion at the end of the first paragraph renders the first sentence of the 2nd paragraph redundant. It was not intended to be mandatory. Grey was the recommended colour, but we did not rule out other colours not already allocated being used by nations which produce multicoloured charts. Your point about the ZOC areas is valid. I therefore propose to reconstruct the paragraph as follows:

If additional emphasis is required, the newly surveyed area may be highlighted on the Source or ZOC diagram with tint. The tint should be grey but may be another colour except green, blue or magenta (see B-293.8 and B-297.2). On ZOC diagrams, the areas of bathymetry outside the re-surveyed area must be reclassified; usually category ‘D’ will be appropriate, as large depth anomalies and new obstructions may now be expected.

An additional bullet point should then be included at B-293.8 as follows:

- Grey tint may be included to highlight areas covered by after disaster surveys (see B-427.8).

For ZOC diagrams, suggest a new paragraph at B-297.2:

Grey tint may be used to highlight areas covered by after disaster surveys (see B-427.8).

Chairman: agree, except to add ‘(or other colour except green, blue or magenta)’ after ‘grey’.

Action 21: Agree with New Zealand comment. Notices to Mariners are designed to promulgate new navigationally significant information (doesn’t matter whether it is (T), (P) or chart correcting), so if the first sentence states that they should not usually be charted, then they should also not warrant NtM action.

Chairman: that argument is not necessarily valid. It may be considered that certain items which frequently move are navigationally significant but cannot be charted because of their temporary nature or frequent moves. However, you are correct that the first sentence’s ‘do not form any significant obstruction’ phrase implies they do not warrant NM action. I think it is possible that there may be a national requirement (for some nations) to notify mariners of their existence and the obvious way is to use (T)NM (and therefore avoid cluttering the charts and causing frequent manual updates). Taking account of your comment, with France and NZ’s, I propose to change the last sentence to:

‘If required, they may be listed in temporary NMs, although this may make them more vulnerable to theft’.

Action 21: If diffuser is going to be used as an example, then suggest an amendment be made at INT1 – L43.

Chairman: L43 really seem unnecessary and may disappear if DE’s suggested reorganization ever takes place. At present the guidance at B-444.8 allows either ‘Obstn’ (as INT1) or ‘Diffuser’ and your suggested wording for B-422.9 agrees with that by the use of the word ‘may’. I will ask the INT1 subWG to consider whether to insert the alternative depiction (perhaps in column 4).

FRANCE

Action 11: From the « Comprehensive Dictionary of Petroleum and other energy sources » and in many articles, FPSO means: “Floating Production, Storage and Offloading”. France suggests adopting this definition.

Chairman: Agree; the quoted IMO Circular also uses ‘Offloading’. We have also amended the references in B-445.5 and in the list of INT abbreviations at B-122.1 (in S-4 Edition 4.3.0).

Action 21a: For the last sentence of the proposition, I suggest reversing the text as follow:

“They may be listed in temporary NMs, although it may be that this action actually makes them more vulnerable to theft.”

Chairman: see comment at Australia.

GERMANY

Action 10: Two sides of the limit should be shown as for K47. I assume that this is meant by “layout similar to N2.2”.

Chairman: Yes, the comment under the title is simply an instruction on how to layout the graphic (and will also apply to INT1).

GREECE

Action 10: The second phrase of the paragraph i.e. “If only part of.... be repeated if required” should be omitted in order to be consistent with what is provided in similar cases of limits defining areas [B-441.6 (N2.2, N31), B-422.8 (K31.2), B-449.6 (N13), B-447.4 (K-47) etc.]

Chairman: In all the examples you have quoted, it should be evident from the orientation of the symbol, which side of the line the information applies to. It is very clear in the case of restricted areas, such as B-441.6, because of the tail of the ‘T’ always points into the area. The others are a bit more subtle and maybe the cartographer can use the same device as suggested in the revised B-447.6. It is necessary to be explicit about it here, as the marine farm symbol has no top or bottom. We have noted for consideration to include this convention in B-125.

NEW ZEALAND

Action 21: Is there a need for the last part of the last sentence about a temporary NTM making them more vulnerable to theft? NTMs relate to safety at sea information, so we don’t consider that the risk of theft should affect the decision.

Chairman: see comment at Australia.

NORWAY

Action 10: Why ‘layout similar to N2.2, etc’? N2.2 is a T-shaped line.

The line should be drawn with two sides of an angle. That is to show if symbol is to be rotated. Ref. French INT 1 K47 (symbol rotated) and K48.1 (symbol not rotated).

Chairman: see comment at Germany.

SPAIN

Action 7: “Nature of bottom” should not be deleted from nautical chart definition.

Chairman: ‘Nature of the bottom/seabed’ was removed as it was judged to be of comparatively minor importance compared to the other items as the list is not intended to be exhaustive. The ‘characteristics of coast’ was removed for the same reason. As most WG members accepted the definition as proposed, we will go ahead and refer it to HDWG without ‘seabed’. However, I consider it is now time to discuss this in more detail at CSPCWG9, and will accordingly add this to the agenda (see also reply to Australia, as highlighted).

Action 17: This new symbol should be added to I25 of INT1.

Chairman: It was agreed at CSPCWG8 that the symbol should not be included in INT1 as that might encourage wider use of the line style by compilers (eg to highlight better surveys on the face of the chart generally) and thereby undermine its specific value (see CSPCWG8 record 8.12).

US (NGA & NOAA)

Add “and seabed”, or something similar. This gives a more general description of features that are still depicted yet does not give specifics.

Chairman: see comment at Spain.