

2nd NCWG MEETING
IHB, Monaco 26-28 April 2016

Paper for Consideration by NCWG

Vacant entries in INT1

Submitted by:	INT1 subWG (Secretary, France, Germany and Spain)
Executive Summary:	A long standing CSPCWG/NCWG work item (E4) is to consider what to do with vacant entries in INT1
Related Documents:	INT1, HSSC7 NCWG Work Plan
Related Projects:	None

Introduction / Background:

1. A long standing, but low priority, work item (E4) is to consider what to do with vacant entries in INT1. No start or end dates had been allocated until HSSC7, when an end date of 2016 was allocated. Additionally, for the first time a milestone was given:
 ‘INT1subWG to supply list to Chair’
2. It is believed that the first edition of INT1 (1987) produced by Germany was provided with entries in anticipation that International symbols may be designed in due course for these items.
3. During the complete revision of S-4 by the CSPCWG, each vacant entry was considered to decide whether there was a need for an international symbol. In some cases such a symbol was designed and incorporated into the next edition of INT1, for example L17. For other entries, it was decided that there was no requirement for an international symbol and the entry was left vacant.
4. It was decided that work item E4 would not be progressed until the revision of S-4 was completed, to see which entries were still vacant after the review. This revision has now been completed, so there is no reason to delay reviewing the vacant entries further.

Analysis / Discussion:

5. The following vacant entries exist:

Number	Term	Recommendation and comments
B3	International Meridian (Greenwich)	Remove from INT1
B24	Boundary mark	Remove from INT1 See B306: ‘use appropriate existing symbol’
B46	Cable (0,1M)	Remove from INT1 But see reference to B130
B48	Fathom(s)	Remove from INT1 Used by UK and US for national abbreviations. Any others? It seems unnecessary to retain an entry simply to show an abbreviation, which will also be included in the list of abbreviations in

		<p>the back of INT1?</p> <p>If it is deemed necessary to retain for national abbreviations, they should be 'lettered' entries rather than numbered.</p>
B60-67	A group of magnetic compass terms, some of which have national abbreviations, but no INT abbreviations exist	<p>Remove from INT1.</p> <p>Reasoning as B48. Note B62 contains ref to B132.</p>
E11-12	These former vacant entries have been removed in the latest versions of INT1 as the terms have been added to E10.1 and E24 respectively, without special symbols being required.	No further action.
F29.2	Oil retention barrier (high pressure pipe)	<p>Remove from INT1.</p> <p>A symbol was shown in early editions of the German INT1, but no S-4 reference was included in Column 6 and it does not seem that an international symbol was ever approved.</p> <p>Can E29.1 then be renumbered as F29 (which covers oil barriers, according to B-449.2)?</p>
H7	Height datum, Land survey datum	Remove from INT1.
L13	Observation/research platform (with name)	Remove from INT1.
L15	Artificial island	<p>Remove from INT1.</p> <p>Extract from CSPCWG7 report: D Prince (CA) explained that these referred to situations where dredged material had been used to create man-made islands on which a platform could be established. However, such artificial islands were last established many years ago, are no longer being created, and most have now disappeared. CA had used a national symbol, but there is no requirement for a special INT symbol.</p> <p>J Wootton (AU) undertook to raise the matter with TSMAD, to consider the implications for the S-57 enumerate.</p> <p>ACTION 8: AU to refer 'Artificial Islands' to TSMAD.</p> <p>JW to confirm that references do not exist in S-57.</p>
L21.3	Wellhead with height above	Remove from INT1.

	sea floor	The majority of CSPCWG members decided that a symbol was not required (Letter 09/2007 refers).
Q6	Retroreflecting material	Remove from INT1. Note: S-4 ref 464 listed; 460.7 would be more appropriate, which states 'must not be depicted on charts'.
Q60	Seaplane anchorage buoy	Remove from INT1.
Q61	Buoy marking traffic separation scheme	Remove from INT1.
Q125	Firing danger area beacons	Remove from INT1.

6. Some or all of these entries may be referenced in the index; these references must be removed if the entry is deleted.

7. The subWG's 'General principles' (see NCWG2-11.1A Annex B) state that:

10g. A previously used INT1 number must not be reused for a different subject, because of the possible confusion caused to references in other publications or databases.

These were inserted in INT1 as place markers at the time of the first edition. As they have never been used for INT symbols, there are no 'retired symbols' (as listed in S-4 B-151.2), so presumably there are no references to these INT1 numbers in other publications or databases. If this can be confirmed, should these numbers be listed as unavailable or can they be reused?

Conclusion:

8. The remaining vacant entries in INT1 contribute nothing useful for the chart user.

Recommendations:

9. Delete all vacant entries at next edition of INT1.

10. Chair to research and advise whether any of these entries are referenced in other IHO standards. If they are, the number should be 'retired' (listed in S-4 B-151.2). Other numbers to be released for re-use.

Justification and Impacts:

11. Tidying up of INT1 and completion of NCWG work item E4.

Action required of NCWG:

12. The NCWG is invited to:

endorse the above recommendations.