



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: 10/2013

UKHO ref: HA317/010/031-10

Telephone:
(Chairman) +44 (0) 1823 337900 ext 3311
(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 20 August 2013

Dear Colleagues,

Subject: Name of Working Group (following Letter 09/2013)

1. CPSCWG Letter 09/2013 requested your views on the subject of our WG's name to progress Action 54 from meeting CSPCWG9 ("to... draft a new proposal"). Thank you to the 20 Working Group members who responded; these are consolidated at Annex A.
2. On this occasion, my Chairman's comments against the individual responses are relatively limited. Rather, I have constructed a draft paper that I intend to submit to HSSC5 (see Annex B).
3. As mentioned in Letter 09/2013, HSSC5 may see discussions on the future of paper charts and how our WG may support this activity in the future. In this context, CPSCWG9 Action 53 is relevant and all respondents provided a positive reply in stating their willingness to engage with this discussion as it develops.
4. This Letter **does not require a reply** but if you wish to make further comment, please provide to me **not later than 10 September** so that I can meet the submission time for papers to HSSC.

Yours sincerely,

Peter G.B. Jones, Chairman

Annex A: CSPCWG Letter 09/2013 consolidated responses

Annex B: HSSC5 – draft paper.

Name of Working Group and Future of the Paper Chart

Consolidated Responses

WG9 Action	Question	Yes	No
54	Do you agree with the recommendation to propose a new name for CSPCWG?	AU, BR, CA, DE, DK, ES, ESRI, FR, GR, IR, JP, NL, NO, SE, UA, UK, US(NOAA), ZA 18	IN, LV 2
	If 'Yes' what should the new name be (tick one box only):		
	Chart Specifications Working Group (CSWG) Chairman: Votes are quite evenly divided between CSWG and another name. The previous support for CSWG has reduced significantly since 2007 (I did not anticipate this). Few respondents in this group provide comment.	BR, DE, DK, ES, ESRI, GR, IR, JP, UA, US(NOAA), ZA 11	
	Another name – please put your suggestion below Chairman: Most respondents in this group provide considered points to explain their thinking.	AU, CA, FR, IHB, NL, NO, SE, UK, US(NOAA) 9	
53	Do you agree to engage in the discussion on the future of the paper chart, providing input to any draft paper and by briefing your national representatives to HSSC5 (in anticipation of discussion in that forum)? Chairman: All respondents provide a positive reply.	AU, BR, CA, DE, DK, ES, ESRI, FR, GR, IN, IR, JP, LV, NL, NO, SE, UA, UK, US(NOAA), ZA 20	

Further comments**AUSTRALIA**

The problem with a name such as “Chart Standardisation Working Group” [or Specifications] is that it implies that the WG is responsible for all Standards [or Specifications] related to charting, which is not the case. TSMAD is responsible for the ENC Standard; DIPWG is responsible for the ECDIS Performance and Portrayal Standard – a name such as this would imply that our WG is the umbrella under which other HSSCV Technical WGs such as TSMAD and DIPWG operates.

Chairman: AU’s arguments stand whether for ‘Standards’ or ‘Specifications’.

The CSPCWG is concerned with the nautical cartography standardisation and specification requirements for nautical charts – no matter what the medium the chart is presented. From this perspective, Australia would suggest something like: **Standardisation of Nautical Cartography Working Group (SNCWG)**

Chairman: Standardization remains our *raison d’être* but also of the other WGs, so perhaps it is not needed in the name. Currently, only CSPCWG and SNPWG have ‘standard’ in their name. Whatever name is eventually chosen, it must indicate that our WG is the core group of experts that reacts to emerging requirements for nautical charts to provide the best relevant information in the most consistent and easily understood format to the mariner, regardless of the form of the nautical chart.

CANADA

I think the former name of our working group has served us well up to this point but I also see a slight departure from what we have been doing within this working group over the past 9 years. As we move forward, I think we will see a change in the look and feel of the traditional paper chart, where it may become a derivative product of the ENC. If this is the route we are going, the work of the group may be one of developing what this type of chart will look like.

I agree with the comments of others that “chart specification” refers to other things in addition to paper charts. I like the thinking of AU where we focus the name on the general field of marine cartography, or nautical cartography.

Chairman: ‘Marine’ and ‘Nautical’ cartography appear to be near synonyms. However, to be consistent with IHO publication S-8 (Standards of Competence for Nautical Cartographers), we should use ‘nautical’ rather than ‘marine’. ‘Nautical’ also aligns with the term ‘nautical chart’ used in SOLAS.

I think the incorporation of a generic name such as that in the name of the WG would be beneficial and represent the direction we need to go.

FRANCE

Charts specifications WG should deal with all specifications for marine charts, and thus, S-57 and the specifications of the ENC which are under the responsibility of the TSMAD. A possible name could be Chart content specifications WG but S-4 concerns also the INT paper chart (Part A) and also specifies some specific guidelines for printed charts (e.g. Section B-200, size of the sheet ...).

If a new name has to be defined, it should reflect that.

Chart Content and Paper Chart WG: CCPCWG

Or

Chart Specifications and Paper Chart WG: CSPCWG...

Chairman: Second name gives the same acronym as now. Also, expresses doubt over using the term ‘specification’. If an aim of change is to remove reference to ‘paper charts’, neither works.

GERMANY

We have discussed the future of our WG in our office and will prepare a note for HSSC5. We see CSWG for the harmonisation and consolidation between paper charts and ENCs. The future tasks should be clearly distinguished from DIPWG and TSMAD but TORs for all should be developed together.

Chairman: Supports ‘Specification’ as a unifying title, contrary to others who see the claim as untrue or inaccurate.

IHB

I like the name proposed by Australia for our WG, i.e. Standardisation of Nautical Cartography Working Group (SNCWG).

INDIA

Since the working group has been dealing with the paper chart standardization and specifications, 'Chart Standardization and Paper Chart Working Group (CSPCWG)' ideally fit for the working group. S4 has not been generalized for digital products as the same has its own standards for production and display.

LATVIA

Thank You for sharing the paper, good clear facts, and reasonable conclusions for financial decisions, as we all need to consider them more and more. As Mr Enabnit says at the beginning, the year of significant change will be 2018. We all do acknowledge that changes are happening, and we all read contradictory papers about that all across the world, but because there are nautical paper charts out there now and still mandatory, probably the renaming of the WG could

bring some question from outside into IHO - for example, what are we predicting if changing it already now. 2018 will come, it will contain a reason and then we can proceed with this question also, if deemed necessary. Not renaming the group does not mean that we can not think and address these new ideas and issues arising, already now.

Chairman: Sees name change as premature (but missed the discussion at WG9).

If to change, reading the objectives of our WG on IHO website, to me right keyword seems "a core of expertise" (experts), "whatever physical form" and "the fundamental concepts and elements of marine cartography", not necessarily only technical standards or specifications. Not imposing, just for consideration: **Cartography (or Charting) Expert WG (CEWG)**. Specific standards, with additional value to user - an art of compiling of a final product, whatever form.

Chairman: Use of the term 'Expert' could increase our standing in the wider community.

However, to me 'expert' seems a given term, not one that is claimed. Also, every technical WG could then seek to include this term in their title. Without 'expert' this is close to Nautical Charting WG or Nautical Cartography WG considered previously.

NETHERLANDS

I'm new in this WG, so I have missed some previous discussions about this subject. I can imagine that CSPCWG has already a certain status in and around IHO. However I might consider a more "readable" name for this WG, which also says that we are dealing with nautical charts.

Although the specifications are defined for paper charts there might be more and more connection with other products, like ENC's and nautical publications. Think for instance about rules for generalisation, knowing that more and more charts/ENC's will be produced from one "product-independent" database.

The name I propose for the WG would be: **Standardisation of Nautical Charts WG (SoNC WG)**.

Chairman: Close to AU & CA.

NORWAY

Standardization of Nautical Cartography Working Group (SNCWG)

Chairman: As AU, CA; some momentum gathering with this late return where Inger will have seen all proposals and comments

SWEDEN

With the background of the discussion we had at the latest CSPCWG meeting and the many wise comments that have been made here I totally agree that it is time to change the name of the working group in order to reflect the route forward in the future. There is a clear need for an IHO working group focusing on the content, generalization and presentation of a chart product regardless if it is a paper chart or an ENC. In this aspect the word Cartography describe the core of what we want to achieve; present complex marine geospatial data in a safe, clear and understandable way for the users.

Chairman: Agree, provided 'cartography' includes 'content' (which I strongly believe it does). Some sound words and phrases here which may be useful to reflect in our TOR and in a new name, if agreed. Also creates a link to the Action 53 question.

I therefore totally support the comments made by Australia and Canada when suggesting the name **Standardisation of Nautical Cartography Working Group**.

Chairman: As AU, CA, NO...

UK

Chairman: On balance, I prefer 'Nautical Cartography' (which I consider includes 'content'). If standardization is 'a given' for the IHO in general, then it could be omitted from our title.

US(NOAA)

Chart Specifications Working Group is acceptable to NOAA. **Chart Standardization Working Group** would also infer that this WG is in the business of standardizing all types of charts, regardless of format (paper/raster/ENC/etc.)

DRAFT Paper for Consideration by HSSC5
Chart Standardization and Paper Chart Working Group (CSPCWG) – Proposed Change of Name

Submitted by:	Chairman CSPCWG
Executive Summary:	The name of CSPCWG has served the Working Group well since its creation in 2002. However, in looking forward, a change of name is now judged to be beneficial. A new name, Nautical Cartography Working Group (NCWG) is proposed.
Related Documents:	CSPCWG9 (Nov 2012) action 54.
Related Projects:	HSSC's annual review of its technical Working Groups: their remits, terms of reference and work plans.

Introduction / Background

1. The name of CSPCWG was given by CHRIS14 (Shanghai, 2002) when the former Chart Standardization Committee (CSC) became a Working Group (WG) of CHRIS. This title, and its associated Terms of Reference, has provided the keystone for the work of CSPCWG over the past 10 years.
2. A possible name change was discussed by CSPCWG in 2006-07 but was not pursued through CHRIS as it was judged premature. Other reorganisation was being considered at that time (as part of the move from CHRIS to HSSC) and the momentum and value of CSPCWG was still developing.
3. In order to re-focus the forward-looking activity of the WG, its role and title has been the subject of review by its membership, following discussion at CSPCWG9 (Seoul, 2012). The meeting and subsequent correspondence concluded that a new name should be developed and a proposal put to HSSC.

Analysis / Discussion

4. Recent agenda discussions at CSPCWG9 have included the on-going relevance of and principles behind the INT chart concept (including the advice provided to International Charting Coordination WGs), and the future of the paper chart more generally. It is further recognised that the conventions and principles in the continuing development of nautical cartography will increasingly be challenged to meet the needs of standard nautical (paper) and electronic (ENC) charts, the relationships between them and their respective roles in serving the mariner. We may see a change in the look and feel of the traditional paper chart (eg where it may become a derivative product of the ENC or a "product-independent" database) where the work of the group may be one of developing what this type of chart will look like. Whilst limited work is in hand to address some of these issues, these aspects are only likely to increase in the future.
5. S-4 (and its supplementary documents) continues to form a firm foundation and acts as a valuable resource in capturing much of the community 'standard' of nautical cartography, its reasoning, value and implementation. This does not solely apply to paper charts as both TSMADWG and DIPWG are dependent on the work of CSPCWG in its maintenance of S-4 as the fundamental guide on chart specifications in whatever format the chart is delivered.
6. The refresh and updating of S-4 has been a long task (CSPCWG Work Plan and numerous IHO CLs refer). In its current major review, S-4 is nearing completion (acknowledging that the world never stands still).
7. Noting the above, CSPCWG agreed that it is time to revisit the name of the WG.
8. The main tasks are chart standardization and specification. The inclusion of 'Paper Chart' within the title may be the source of some misconceptions about the WG's business and does not adequately reflect the role in providing a core of expertise on the basic concepts of charting (whatever the physical form of the chart), as stated in the Terms of Reference.
9. A wide range of potential WG names have been considered. Influencing factors are the WG's core remit and clarity of purpose (particularly in comparison to other technical WGs) and the

acronyms that would result, amongst others. Examples of the range of options considered include: Chart Specifications, Nautical Charting, Nautical Cartography, Charting Standards, Chart Specifications, Chart Content, Paper Chart Presentation, Chart Development.

10. In 2007, the WG considered 'Chart Specifications WG' to be the most suitable and that title still retains significant support. However, we seek to avoid implying that the WG is responsible for *all* standards or specifications related to charting, which is not the case. TSMAD through S57/S101 is responsible for the ENC Standard; DIPWG is responsible for the ECDIS Performance and Portrayal Standard. Terms of 'Chart/ing' and 'Specification' blurs the line with ENC.

Conclusion

11. There is a clear need for a WG focusing on the content, generalization and presentation of a chart product regardless if it is a paper chart or an ENC. In this aspect, the word '**Cartography**' describes the core of what we want to achieve: presenting complex marine geospatial data in a safe, clear and understandable way for the user, promoting standardization and developing specifications for emerging requirements for nautical charts.
12. Taking all into account, Standardization of Nautical Cartography Working Group emerged with significant support (SNCWG). However, noting:
 - the recent establishment of the Surface Currents WG with a similar acronym (SCWG);
 - the continuation of SNPWG; and
 - a view that 'Standardization' as a term seems superfluous within the context of IHO technical WGs, which all deal in this aspect,a shortened name **Nautical Cartography Working Group (NCWG)** is proposed.

Recommendations

13. The Chart Standardization and Paper Chart Working Group (CSPCWG) is renamed the Nautical Cartography Working Group (NCWG).

Justification and Impacts

14. The benefit is to establish a focus on looking forward to the challenges in Nautical Cartography in a name that best recognises the WG's scope and purpose.
15. No adverse impacts are identified.
16. If agreed:
 - the WG's Terms of Reference will be reviewed to ensure alignment;
 - The name will take effect at the conclusion of the next meeting (CSPCWG10, Jan 2014).

Action Required of HSSC5

17. HSSC5 is invited to agree the proposal to alter the name of CSPCWG to NCWG.