|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **INTERNATIONAL HYDROGRAPHIC ORGANIZATION**  4b, quai Antoine Ier B.P. 445 MC 98011 MONACO CEDEX PRINCIPAUTE DE MONACO | Iho_coul | **ORGANISATION HYDROGRAPHIQUE INTERNATIONALE**  Tel. : +377 93 10 81 00 Fax : +377 93 10 81 40 Email : [info@iho.int](mailto:info@iho.int) Web : www.iho.int |

|  |
| --- |
|  |
| **NAUTICAL CARTOGRAPHY Working Group** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Chair: Mikko HOVI  Finnish Transport Agency  Opastinsilta 12 A  00520 Helsinki  Finland | Secretary: Andrew HEATH-COLEMAN  United Kingdom Hydrographic Office  Admiralty Way, Taunton, Somerset  United Kingdom |
| Tel: +358 29 5343463 | Tel: +44 1823 483218 |
| Email: mikko.hovi@liikennevirasto.fi | Email: [andrew.coleman@ukho.gov.uk](mailto:andrew.coleman@ukho.gov.uk) |

**NCWG Letter: 03/2017**

UKHO ref: HA317/010/031-14

Finnish ref: LIVI/326/00.03.01/2017

Date: 12 September 2017

**Subject: NCWG3 – Secretary actions (Group 1)**

Dear Colleagues

During NCWG3, I accepted 20 new actions, which I will endeavour to work through over the next few months. I will keep you informed of progress and ask for your advice as appropriate.

**Action 1: Secretary to produce draft report of NCWG3 by end of June 2017, for participants to approve**. This has been completed and the final report has been distributed.

**Action 6: Review of IHO resolutions associated with NCWG activities.** I have forwarded my suggestions to our Chair and Yves Guillam to progress.

**Action 32: Secretary to amend INT1subWG TOR and procedures as agreed;**

**Action 37: Secretary to update NCWG EN template to include ‘Possible impact on ENC’.**

I have completed these two actions and sent them to IHO Secretariat for inclusion in a new area within the NCWG part of the IHO Website.

This letter begins the process for another five, all of which require responses from WG members but should not require submission to HSSC.

**Action 17: Secretary to include clarification on option to use a range of colours for floodlighting symbol in next edition of S-4.**

NCWG3-08.1A proposed that the colour of the floodlight symbol P63 should not be limited to yellow/orange on multicoloured charts, as in fact floodlighting could be in various colours. While not all floodlight colours would have an exact equivalent available in the chart palette, an available colour from the palette could be chosen which is sufficiently close to the actual colour to help the mariner in identifying which structure is being charted, whereas a yellow or orange symbol could be misleading.

The meeting agreed with my suggested wording, to be included as a clarification to S-4 at the next opportunity. Since the meeting, I have wondered how a compiler should chart floodlighting which cycles through various colours. The nearest equivalent would be B-470.4a(ii): ‘If the light is multicoloured and the sectors are not charted, a single magenta flare should be used’. I have therefore suggested the additions temporarily shown in sloping text below.

Amend B-478.2 to read:

**Floodlighting** of a structure (for example: a pier; pier-head lighthouse) or a danger close to navigable water, should be indicated by the symbol IP63**P63.** The symbol must *normally* be in magenta or may be in an appropriate colour on ‘multicoloured’ charts *where the colour is known and constant*. Alternatively, it may be indicated by the **international abbreviation** ‘(illum)’ against the structure or feature being lit, on the appropriate side if known.

**Action 19: Secretary to check that S-4 has nothing contradictory on cables to Res.4/1967 (as amended by IHO-A1).**

Res.4/1967 (as amended by IHO-A1 following lobbying by ICPC) provides standard text to be used in publications for submarine cables and the possible consequences of damage to them, including ‘very severe criminal penalties’ for the mariner. The revised text is written more from a ‘protection of the cables’ point of view than the ‘safety of the mariner’. Naturally, S-4 B-443 is written to provide guidance for chart compilers and emphasises the safety of the mariner. Therefore, the two texts do not have the same purpose, or the same emphases. NCWG3 rejected changing S-4 at present (as ICPC failed to provide supporting information to their submission NCWG3-08.3A or representation at the meeting) provided there is nothing contradictory between the text of S-4 and the new publications text. In fact, there is nothing contradictory in them, although it should be noted that the S-4 text does not conform to the ICPC preferences, including taking account of deep-sea mining. I recommend no further action for NCWG unless ICPC re-opens a dialogue on the subject.

**Action 23: Secretary to draft clarification to S-4 B-431.2 to provide guidance on the depiction of anchor berth swinging circles and circulate to WG for review.**

The NCWG3 meeting considered seven different options (including the four submitted by Italy in paper NCWG3-08.7A) for depicting anchor berth swinging circles where the actual anchor berth falls off limits. In most such cases, it is likely that there will be other complete swinging circles on the chart and it will be obvious that the magenta dashed arc will be another swinging circle, for which the centre is off limits (and would normally be fully shown on the next smaller scale chart). Occasionally, it may be the only swinging circle intruding onto the chart and therefore it may not be obvious what the magenta dashed line represents. The red wording below provides guidance based on the preferred (and simplest) option agreed at NCWG3 and is consistent with similar situations where incomplete areas are charted.

On large scale charts, swinging circles for anchor berths may be shown by fine, dashed magenta lines:

**N11.2**

If the actual anchor berth falls off the chart limits, the meaning of the dashed magenta arc may be clarified, if considered necessary, by the addition of at least one anchor berth symbol (with or without designation) embedded in the limit. Symbols should be inserted at intervals of approximately 40mm or closer and not exceeding 50mm. This addition will not usually be necessary if other complete swinging circles are charted in the vicinity.

**ACTION 26: Secretary to add clarification to S-4 B-254 that ‘other charts’ may include limits of larger scale ENC coverage and circulate to WG members for review.**

The NCWG3 meeting considered the Australian submission NCWG3-08.10A. It decided that the proposed note is unnecessary and potentially misleading. However, it also decided that the option to show the limits of larger scale ENC on paper charts could be useful, especially where there is no equivalent paper chart, although it is unnecessary to quote the cell number(s) which would add clutter especially where there are multiple cells involved. The following addition at the end of B-254.2 is proposed:

**Limits of larger scale ENC coverage** may be shown, if considered useful and especially where there is no equivalent paper chart, in the same way as larger scale paper charts described above. They must simply be labeled ‘ENC’ and the limits should indicate only the area of actual data coverage.

**ACTION 30: Secretary to research whether there is any guidance on position of magnetic arrow related to direction of magnetic variation or variation change and draft appropriate guidance for S-4.**

Although NCWG3-09.3 was about the units used for charting magnetic variation, Ben Timmerman of Netherlands took the opportunity to ask which way the arrow on the magnetic arrow should face, specifically whether it should ‘point’ to the direction of the variation or to the direction of the change in variation.


This is not currently stated in the text of S-4 at B-261 or B-272.3, although B-261 states that ‘Compass roses should be in magenta in the form shown at B-260’. The examples shown in B-260 point to the direction of variation (West), not to the direction of change (East). This seems logical given that the primary purpose of the arrow is to show magnetic variation, with the rate and direction of change shown as a secondary parenthesis. The French and Spanish INT1 version follow the same convention but the German (English) version is the opposite. However, note that in all German waters the variation and direction of change is only eastwards. If the convention proposed below is accepted, I will invite Germany to amend INT1 at the next edition.

I suggest the following clarification should be added at the end B-272.3:

The arrow head should be on the side of the direction of the magnetic variation (rather than the direction of change, if different).

A response form is attached at Annex. Please respond by **7 November 2017.**

Yours sincerely,



Andrew Heath-Coleman

Secretary NCWG

Annex to NCWG Letter 03/2017

**NCWG3 – Secretary actions (Group 1)**

Response Form

(please return to NCWG Secretary by **7 November 2017**)

[andrew.coleman@ukho.gov.uk](mailto:andrew.coleman@ukho.gov.uk)

If you vote ‘No’ to any of the following questions, please explain in the ‘Comments’ section. You can also use that section to record other suggestions, e.g. for different names.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Question** | **Yes** | **No** |
| 1a | **Action 17:**  Do you agree with the proposal to allow using different colours for the floodlighting symbol on multicoloured charts? |  |  |
| 1b | Do you agree with the proposed revised wording at B-478.2, including the changes from the wording proposed in NCWG3-08.1A (temporarily shown in sloping type)? |  |  |
| 2 | **Action 19:**  Do you agree that there is no current need to change any text in S-4 (until ICPC re-open a dialogue)? |  |  |
| 3 | **Action 23:**  Do you agree with the proposed addition to B-431.2? |  |  |
| 4 | **Action 26:**  Do you agree with the proposed changes to B-254.2? |  |  |
| 5a | **Action 30:**  Do you agree that the arrowhead on the Magnetic North arrow should face towards the direction of the variation? |  |  |
| 5b | Do you agree with the suggested addition to B-272.3? |  |  |

Further comments:

Name:

Organization: