# INTERNATIONAL HYDROGRAPHIC ORGANIZATION



# ORGANISATION HYDROGRAPHIQUE INTERNATIONALE

**IHB File No. S3/4405** 

# CIRCULAR LETTER 34/2014 28 April 2014

# CHART SPECIFICATIONS OF THE IHO (S-4) Approval of Revised Specifications related to Sections B-400 and C-400 Hydrography and Aids to Navigation

References:

- A. IHO Circular Letter 70/2013 dated 2 December 2013 Revised Specifications related to Sections B-400 and C-400 Hydrography and Aids to Navigation
- B. IHO Publication S-4 Part B Chart Specifications of the IHO

# Dear Hydrographer,

- 1. Reference A proposed the adoption of revised chart specifications considered by the IHO Chart Standardization and Paper Chart Working Group (CSPCWG) for:
  - a. Showing limits of surveys on charts;
  - b. Discontinuities between surveys;
  - c. Reported dangers.
- 2. The Directing Committee would like to thank the following 36 Member States: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Iceland, India, Italy, Japan, Morocco, Netherlands, Norway, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Singapore, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Tunisia, Turkey, UK and USA, who replied to Reference A.
- 3. The Member States' responses and the outcome of their review by the CSPCWG Chair are provided in the Annex to this letter. In summary:
  - a. Showing limits of surveys on charts: 34 Member States supported the proposal, 2 Member States objected.
  - b. Discontinuities between surveys: 33 Member States supported the proposal, 1 Member State abstained and 2 Member States objected.
  - c. Reported dangers: All 36 Member States supported the proposal.
- 4. The amended specifications, taking into account the comments in Annex A, will be included in the next revision of IHO Publication S-4.

On behalf of the Directing Committee Yours sincerely,

Gilles BESSERO Director

# MEMBER STATES' RESPONSES TO CL 70/2013 AND COMMENTS FROM THE CSPCWG CHAIR Hydrography and Aids to Navigation

# **CROATIA**

Croatia supports all proposals for the new and revised specifications of the IHO pub. S-4. We keep the proposals very important and useful for the process of paper chart production and updating. Croatia highly appreciates the work of the CSPC working group that resulting in those proposals.

<u>Comment from Chairman CSPCWG</u>: Thank you for these expressions of support. It is worth noting that, as explained in section B-100, much of the portrayal of features on charts specified in S-4 is relevant to both electronic and paper charts.

#### **FRANCE**

B-416.1: If the proposed revision is approved, the illustration should be adjusted so that the 'white' gap has a width of 3mm.

<u>Comment from Chairman CSPCWG</u>: Agree. France has agreed to supply a revised graphic to CSPCWG Secretary for inclusion in S-4.

# **GERMANY** (voted against 'b')

B-416.1: Additional solutions as the example shows in B-416.1 are not appropriate as for S-57 and S-52 this is unconvertible and requires another depiction. The amount of special solutions/rules should be reduced as possible.

<u>Comment from Chairman CSPCWG</u>: New guidance as to how to encode a discontinuity between surveys on ENCs has been included in S-57 Appendix B.1, Annex A – Use of the Object Catalogue for ENC, at clause 5.8.4. This new guidance is a direct adaptation for ENC of the revised guidance at B-416.1.

#### **INDIA**

B-415.2: This option should be left with HO's/Cartographer's discretion based on the purpose of the chart.

<u>Comment from Chairman CSPCWG</u>: Agree; the text is framed to provide options which can only be selected by the producer depending on the particular circumstances.

**SOUTH AFRICA** (abstained on 'b', without comment).

# **TUNISIA** (voted against 'a')

B415.2: Including limits of areas investigated by sonar on charts would not have any added value for the navigator due to the fact that this term already appears on the Source diagram. On the contrary, it could, on the one hand, lead the navigator to confusion with the dredging area, and commits the chart producer nation to assume permanent responsibility as to the reliability of the data on the other.

Comment from Chairman CSPCWG: The specification makes clear that this device is to be used only in exceptional circumstances and always with a legend closely associated with the limit, referring to the Source diagram or an explanatory note. There should be no risk of confusion with a dredged area provided this is done and also the fact that a dredged area will be devoid of soundings and also contain a different legend. The producer nation is not 'assuming responsibility as to the reliability of

the data' by drawing attention to the area which has been investigated in situ, any more than it is by showing the same area on the Source diagram.

# TURKEY (voted against 'a' and 'b')

B-415.2: It is considered that the proposed change will encourage the depiction of survey limits on the face of the chart. The present form of B-415.2 is considered to be sufficient for use. For this reason TR does not support the proposal.

<u>Comment from Chairman CSPCWG</u>: The specifications states clearly that this device should only be used in exceptional circumstances. CSPCWG viewed several examples which convinced them of the need for this option.

B-416.1: Such a presentation will cause a visual ambiguity on the face of the chart. It is considered that B-411.2 is sufficient to draw the navigator's attention to inadequacy in survey data. For this reason TR does not support the proposal.

Comment from Chairman CSPCWG: The intention is certainly to create a question in the navigator's mind on why contours do not meet; this is not new. However, the existing depiction recommended at B-416.1 has proved confusing to a significant number of mariners, according to responses to a DQWG survey conducted in 2011. CSPCWG believe that providing the dates of the surveys in situ should make the reason clearer. The use of approximate contours (as in B-411.2) could be very misleading where the discontinuity is large, as in the graphic.

# UK

UK endorses these revisions of IHO Publication S-4 and recognises the commitment and contribution made by CSPCWG members to the task.