



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: 11/2013

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 3 September 2013

Dear Colleagues,

Subject: Actions from 9th CSPCWG meeting: Group 2 'Aids to navigation' – follow-up to Letter 06/2013.

Thank you to the 20 WG members who responded to Letter 6/2013. As usual, Annex A to this letter includes all the responses, 'votes' and Chairman's comments.

For **actions 10, 12, 17 and 20** we have a good consensus and can now proceed to submit these to Member States for approval (with a few minor revisions as indicated in the Annex).

For **Action 18**, the 'new' light vessel symbol, it seems we would benefit from having a further discussion about the symbol itself, the proposed location in INT1 and perhaps about what sort of buoys might be used to support a 'major' light. We will produce a paper for WG10 to start a new discussion.

For **Action 33**, the original question raised by US about radio-activated fog signals has now extended to include radio-activated lights which exist in Canada (and may spread further). We therefore need to discuss further how the mariner might be alerted on charts; I would be grateful if Canada (with the most experience of this issue) could prepare a discussion paper for WG10.

There is no need to reply to this letter.

Yours sincerely,

Peter G.B. Jones,
Chairman

Annex A: Consolidated Responses to CSPCWG Letter 06/2013 (with Chairman's comments)

CSPCWG9 Actions drafts: Group 2 'Aids to navigation'

Consolidated Responses to CSPCWG Letter 06/2013

WG9 Action	Question	Yes	No
10	Do you agree with the assessment of where 'no action required' or 'add cross reference'?	AU, BR, CA, DE, DK, ES, ESRI, FI, FR, GR, IN, IR, IT, JP, LV, NO, NZ, SE, UK, US	
	Do you agree with the proposed rewording of B-472.1 Chairman: unanimous. See also AU's remark and my response for a change of location.	AU, BR, CA, DE, DK, ES, ESRI, FI, FR, GR, IN, IR, IT, JP, LV, NO, NZ, SE, UK, US	
12 mark one box only	Do you prefer the proposed revision of existing B-475.7, or	ES, IR, JP,	
	Do you prefer the new simplified version? Chairman: a clear preference for the simplified version. No reasons given by those preferring the existing version.	AU, BR, CA, DE, DK, ESRI, FI, FR, GR, IN, IT, LV, NO, NZ, SE, UK, US	
17	Do you agree with the wording of the proposed new B-478.4?	AU, BR, CA, DE, DK, ES, ESRI, FI, FR, GR, IN, IR, IT, JP, LV, NO, NZ, SE, UK, US	
	Do you agree that B-478.4 is an appropriate location in S-4? Chairman: unanimous; no other proposals to consider.	AU, BR, CA, DK, ES, ESRI, FI, FR, GR, IN, IR, IT, JP, LV, NO, NZ, SE, UK, US	
18	Do you agree with the proposed revision of B-474.1-2?	BR, CA, DK, ESRI, FI, GR, IN, IR, IT, JP, NO, NZ, SE,	AU, ES, FR, US
	Is the reinstated light vessel symbol:		
	sufficiently distinct from the light float Q30 and	AU, BR, CA, DE, DK, ES, ESRI, FI, FR, GR, IN, IR, IT, JP, LV, NO, NZ, SE, US	
	sufficiently more prominent than Q30? If you answer 'no' to either of these questions, please explain below and offer an alternative. Chairman: The INT1 subWG considered that the new symbol for a Light Vessel would be better at P6 than Q32 and the actual symbol should be reconsidered at WG10 (because it is insufficiently distinctive from the minor light float). Despite the general consensus indicated by the votes opposite, taking the subWG remarks together with some of the comments below, I conclude that there is further work to do on this, and will prepare something for WG10.	BR, DK, ES, FI, FR, GR, IN, IR, IT, JP, LV, NO, NZ, SE, US	AU, CA, DE, ESRI,
20	Do you agree to add the proposed clarification to B-460.4b? Chairman: unanimous; no other proposals to consider.	AU, BR, CA, DE, DK, ES, ESRI, FI, FR, GR, IN, IR, IT, JP, LV, NO, NZ, SE, UK, US	
33	Do you have any further information about radio-activated lights or fog signals?	CA, US	AU, BR, DE, DK, ES, ESRI, FI,

			FR, GR, IN, IR, IT, JP, LV, NO, NZ, SE, UK
--	--	--	---

Further comments

AUSTRALIA

Action 10: Suggest adding “or” after the semicolon at the end of the first bullet point.

AU only concern over the location of this new wording is that it is in the section “Light Descriptions: Abridging, Omission”, which seems a strange place to include a “definition”. Not a big deal as there will be references to this clause as a result of the first part of this Action, however, perhaps consideration may be given to including this information in B-470 (Lights: General)?

Chairman: Agree to add ‘or’ as suggested. Your point about the placement is well made. We will include the actual definition as worded in B-470.2, amend the various cross references accordingly, and replace the definition at B-472.1 with a cross reference.

Action 12: In the first paragraph of (b) (revised version) and the 3rd last paragraph of the proposed “simplified” wording, there are fairly complex descriptions of the depiction of multicoloured directional lights having a direction line. Suggest that a pictorial example(s) be included under the paragraph (and perhaps discussion as to whether examples are required in INT1).

Chairman: This can be achieved by moving P30.2 under the third paragraph, and amend the examples in the text to agree with the graphic.

Action 17: AU comment on location of this clause was only in relation to having a clause relating to light “pointers” being located before a clause relating to a specific type of light which may be used as an aid to navigation (strip lights). We can see the sense in the argument that it would be better to use a clause number that is not currently used, so have no issue with the proposed location in S-4.

Chairman: Thank you.

Action 18: AU has never really been happy with restricting the buoy symbols to just the “superbuoy” symbol for a major light, because modern technology allows for much stronger lights to be mounted on much smaller structures (e.g. latticed pillar buoys). Would rather state that major lights are normally mounted on light vessels or superbouys, but may be mounted on other buoy shapes. In regard to “LANBY”, suggest that “Superbuoy” be used in B-474.1 and B-474.2 rather LANBY, given that the indication is that LANBY’s are no longer used (also should be discussed for INT1 P6).

Chairman: Agree. However, we need to take account of B-460.4a, which states that ‘standard’ buoys include ‘high focal plane’ buoys. For a light to be a major light, ie with sufficient range however powerful, its focal plane needs to be ‘high’.

Action 18: In the last paragraph, it is stated that “The colour of the structure does not indicate on which side it should be passed ...”. I have seen a photograph of a large vessel painted totally red with a large red light mounted on it, and do not think this is an isolated case. Would rather this sentence read similar to: “The colour of the structure does not normally indicate on which side it should be passed and therefore should generally not be charted (this is consistent with the omission of colour from major shore light structures on paper charts), but may be included, if relevant.”.

Chairman: I believe most light vessels are painted red. A red (=lateral) light must be unusual for a ‘major light’, but by our new definition (Action 10) could be used to mark an offshore danger or a port access channel and therefore could be an IALA system light and presumably therefore coloured according to the IALA buoyage system. Agree your proposal, except that ‘generally’ should be ‘normally’ for consistency with other similar clauses. We can use ‘usually’ for the first ‘normally’ to avoid using the same word twice in the sentence to mean different things.

Action 18: Does the symbol need to be more prominent? The structure on its own is not the most important feature of this – the light is. Therefore the light description should be just as important an indicator to the mariner that the light is a “major” light. Don’t consider that it is less prominent, so OK.

Chairman: Agree.

CANADA

Action 18: Though there is differentiation between the 2 symbols, I would not say that there is more prominence for the Light Vessel symbol. Also agree with AU suggestion for the use of the term “superbuoy”.

Action 33: There are both radio activated fog signals and lights in Canada.

Chairman: Please could CA advise if (and how) this information is communicated to the mariner.

ESRI

Action 18: Q32 is clearly distinguishable from Q30; however, it does not appear to be sufficiently more prominent. In other words, I do not think the differences between Q30 and Q32, although they are easy to distinguish, help to determine a hierarchy between the two.

FRANCE

Action 18:

- AU argument should be considered;
- the word “paper” should be deleted in “on paper charts” at the end of B-472.2 (should be B-474.2) if we consider that S-4 is for all charts (paper and ENC);
- If Q32 is adopted, the description for P6 in INT1 should be amended to delete reference to light vessel.

Chairman:

- See comments at AU.
- In this context ENC are different from paper, because the colour of the structure can be populated in the attributes
- INT1 subWG considered the new symbol would be better included in P6.

GERMANY

Action 10: I fully support Aus comment to add “or” after the first bullet point

Chairman: agreed.

Action 18: As we know from Action 20 that there is no more LANBY service worldwide, P6 should be an obsolescent symbol or we could change description to superbuoy. In INT 1 it also stands for light vessels and major light floats. Should Q32 as the reinstated light vessel symbol also stand for a major light float?

Chairman: that is covered by the S-4 remark ‘(also known as lightship or major light float)’. But the main term is sufficient in INT1.

In INT 1 the subtitles and their references at P have to be changed, e.g. Floating lights see Q.

Chairman: Agree



INDIA

Action 18: Clarification required on top mark whether fixed or variable for the proposed Q32.

Chairman: the ‘old’ Light Vessel symbol, which we proposed to reuse, does not have a topmark. But the fact that the old ‘star’ at the top of the mast (from which the flare was originally positioned) is sometimes confused with an X topmark is another reason for reconsidering this symbol. Taking account of AU’s comments about colour, perhaps any new symbol should have the facility for adding a topmark too.

ITALY

Action 18: The title of B-474 is Major floating lights. Therefore, we suggest not to place the symbol of light vessel as Q32 of INT1 because the title for this sub-section is “Minor Light Floats”. We think it would be better to insert both symbol (light vessel and LANBY) in section P, sub-section “Major Floating Lights”, making difference between P6.1 and P6.2 as following:

6.1	
6.2	

Chairman: this accords with the INT1 subWG’s conclusion.

SPAIN

Action 18: We think that the new symbol could be coded as P 6.2, and the current symbol P 6 be coded as P 6.1

Chairman: this accords with the INT1 subWG’s conclusion.

US (NOAA)

Action 18: Recommend allowing the flexibility for other types of aids to be considered major lights, such as latticed pillar buoys. See AU comments.

Chairman: Agree, but see comment at AU.

Action 33: See CSPCWG9-08.8A. The United States now has over 75 user activated sound signals.

Chairman: see comment at CA. If these are now common in North America (and also include radio/user-activated lights) we may need to give further consideration to standardizing charting practice.