

10th CSPWG MEETING
Wellington, New Zealand, 21-24 January, 2014

Paper for Consideration by CSPCWG
Maintained / Dredged Areas

Submitted by:	UK
Executive Summary:	A further contribution to the discussion on maintained/dredged areas
Related Documents:	CSPCWG9-08.22; CSPCWG10-08.1A
Related Projects:	S-4 B-414; INT1 I21-23

Introduction / Background

CSPCWG10-08.1A was drafted by Australia, after correspondence between UK and AU in fulfilment of CSPCWG9 Action 43.

The paper recommends:

1. That CSPCWG consider amending the descriptions of INT1 symbols I21 – I23 as follows:
 - a. I21: Channel or area with minimum surveyed depth
 - b. I22: Channel or area not regularly maintained with minimum surveyed depth and year of latest survey
 - c. I23: Channel or area with maintained depth
2. That CSPCWG consider amending S-4 – B-414 similar to the sample text [below].

If possible, one of the methods of defining the type of dredged area below (I22 or I23) should be used, in consultation with the local authority. However, if that is not possible, eg:

- because the area is known to be “not maintained” but the year of dredging or date of latest control survey is not known; or
- because the local authority does not permit the use of the term ‘Maintained’,

then the depth only should be charted (I21). Where symbol I21 is used and the area is considered “not maintained”, an explanatory note should also be included, eg:

DREDGED DEPTHS

Dredged depths may be less than charted. For the latest information, consult the Port Authority [or Harbour Master or Pilot].

Consideration may also be given to charting a maximum authorized draught (M18, see B-434.5) instead of a dredged or maintained depth, if agreed by the local authority.

These recommendations were based on the assumption that ‘the symbols I21 – I23 are retained in INT1’. UK considers that this assumption should be reconsidered.

Analysis / Discussion

The existing three separate entries in INT1 have been the source of confusion among cartographers, port authorities, mariners (and even members of the CSPCWG!). In particular:

- there is no obvious difference between I21 (left hand) and I23 (left hand);
- the implication of the word ‘maintained’ has been differently understood (ie does it qualify the depth or the area/channel?);
- AU commented (see CSPCWG10-08.1A) that ‘Mariners did not distinguish between symbols I21 and I23’.

We should therefore aim to replace the existing guidance, symbology and explanatory text with something unambiguous and easily understood by all interested parties.

The primary marine interest in a delimited area or channel is the actual depth the mariner can expect to find, so this should always be present. Only if some circumstances mean that the charted depth may not be the actual depth is further information needed.

If the depth is not being maintained but was last surveyed at a certain time (following dredging or simply to confirm it had not silted), then the date is of interest to the mariner. The word 'dredged' seems unnecessary and may not be appropriate anyway.

If the area is being maintained, perhaps by regular dredging or dredging when a vessel is expected, but the port authority is not prepared to claim that the charted depth is always present, then some means of explaining this is required. This is too complicated to state in situ, so a note is needed. '(see Note)' could be added under the depth if room, or perhaps at the harbour entrance (and repeated if necessary) if there are many areas, some of which are too small to contain a '(see Note)' legend.

It seems therefore to be sufficient to have 2 entries in INT1:

I21 (graphic as existing) 'Channel or area; minimum depth regularly maintained'

I22 (remove 'Dredged to' from graphic) 'Channel or area; minimum depth not regularly maintained and year of latest survey'

I23 can be retired.

There is no need to include a '(see Note)' in the first graphic as it is self explanatory. The guidance in S-4 would need to explain that a note would often (even usually) be necessary, warning the mariner of the possibility that the depth may be less than charted and how to obtain up to date information, eg:

[CHANNEL/BERTH] DEPTHS

Depths in the marked channels [and/or berthing areas]
may be less than charted. For the latest information,
consult the Port Authority [or Harbour Master or Pilot].

Contrary to AU experience, UK port surveyors are unanimous that announcing differences between charted and actual depths in channels and areas by (T)NM (whether local or from the HO) is an unnecessary burden. Contact with port authorities, whether by VTS, radio, telephone, internet, or through the pilots is normal and the appropriate way to get the latest information. They welcomed the idea of a note on charts to encourage this. However, whichever method is used does not affect the above proposal.

This option has been discussed and agreed with AU since CSPCWG10-08.1A was issued.

Note that the sub-title to I20-25 in INT1 does not refer to dredged or maintained depth. It is 'Depths in Fairways and Areas'. The sub-title in INT1 should be changed to 'Depths in channels and areas' (as the word 'Fairway' is not relevant here).

Recommendations

Reduce INT1 symbology to I21 and I22, amending the descriptive terms and sub-section title as above.

Update S-4 to reflect this change, including an explanation of the need (usually) for a note and an example.

Justification and Impacts

A much needed simplification and clarification of the symbols used for dredged and maintained channels in harbour areas.

Action required of CSPCWG

CSPCWG is invited to:

- a. Consider this paper; and
- b. Determine appropriate changes to INT1 and S-4 (if any).