

**6th CSPCWG MEETING  
IHB, Monaco, 1-3 December 2009**

**Paper for Consideration by CSPCWG**

**Location of Aquaculture Symbols in INT1**

<b>Submitted by:</b>	INT1 subWG
<b>Executive Summary:</b>	To progress work plan item E8: Move part of INT1 K into L
<b>Related Documents:</b>	INT1. Possibly numerous other documents and databases
<b>Related Projects:</b>	See also CSPCWG6-11.2A

**Introduction**

Work Plan item E8 derives from a Danish suggestion at CSPCWG4, to move INT1 symbols K44.1-K48.2 into a new 'aquaculture' sub-section in L, numbered L45.1-L49.2. The following is an excerpt from CSPCWG4 report:

'1.1. Rearrangement of sections K and L Docs CSPCWG 4-12.4A Rearrangements of sections K and L (INT1) (DK): The meeting agreed that DK's suggestion to transfer 'aquaculture' symbols from INT1 section K to section L is logical (although not essential). It was decided to add this to the work plan as a low priority action for the INT1 subWG. Nevertheless, the action should ideally be completed before S-100 is complete, in order to incorporate new references. (NB: S-100 is likely to be published later in 2009).

**ACTION 33 (of CSPCWG4): INT1 subWG to discuss way to implement DK suggestion on moving part of K to L in INT1.'**

**Analysis / Discussion**

The Danish suggestion has logic to support it. Nevertheless, it would not conform to the normal practice in INT1 of starting sub-sections at a multiple of 10. Also, it would leave no space for possible future additions to the pipelines sub-section (such as pipeline in a tunnel). It would mean renumbering 8 symbols (with possible consequences to other publications).

It can be argued that aquaculture installations would fit equally well into the section on 'Offshore Installations' or into K, as they are in fact obstructions to navigation. K could be broken into sub-sections, eg:

- 4 sub-sections: General; Rocks; Wrecks and Fouls; Obstructions (including Aquaculture);
- 5 sub-sections: General; Rocks; Wrecks and Fouls; Obstructions; Aquaculture.

There are other possibilities.

INT1 is a document which has evolved over time and is not always as logical as we would like it to be: but we cannot start with a blank document. Combining Wrecks, Fouls and Obstructions into one sub-section may be more logical, but would mean more renumbering (ie K40-K43.2 would become K32-K35.2 and K44.1-K48.2 would become K40-K44.2). A further disadvantage would be numbers being re-used. It would be simpler to start a new Aquaculture sub-section, beginning with either K50 or L50.

So the questions are:

1. Should 'Aquaculture' (existing K44.1-K48.2) be transferred to Section L (as suggested by DK)?
  - 1a. If yes, should the new sub-section begin with L-45 or L-50?
2. Should 'Aquaculture' (existing K44.1-K48.2) be retained in Section K?
  - 2a. If yes, should they be transferred to a new sub-section from K-50?
3. Should section K be renamed, eg 'Rocks, Wrecks, Obstructions, Aquaculture' or something else such as 'Dangers [or obstructions] to navigation'?

3b. If yes, should section K be divided into 4 or 5 sub-sections (as listed above)?

The subWG have not reached consensus on this issue. The following is a précis of views expressed:

**ES:** We are in favour of option 1, starting the new sub-section with L-50. We can change the title for Section L to 'Offshore/Inshore Installations' or easier 'Installations' or even more 'Installations at sea' (In Spanish means offshore and inshore, the same in English?) and then include the new sub-section 'Aquaculture' in it as L50.

**FR:** 'Aquaculture' (existing K44.1-K48.2) should not be transferred to Section L. Section K should be renamed eg 'Rocks, Wrecks, Obstructions, Aquaculture' or something else such as 'Dangers [or obstructions] to navigation'. It should be divided into 5 sub-sections (as listed above) to add aquaculture.

**DE:** We have discussed this item very long and came to the solution to put the sub-section "Aquaculture" under L starting with L50. We distinguish with this solution more between natural and artificial obstructions. The proposal for a new heading "Dangers to navigation" for K can be supported.

**Secretary** (comments reviewed and approved by Chairman CSPCWG): As I look through INT1, it seems to me that there are many items either out-of-place or, more often, that could be in two or more sections. For example: should D8 be in E; E18 be in D; F10 in U; F29 be in K, L or N; L20-24 be in K; M40.2 be in N; N60 be in K....etc? Some actually are in two places, eg K31 and L22.

Section L is headed 'Offshore Installations'; generally 'offshore' is taken to imply comparatively deep water some distance from the coastline. (I am not sure if that is true of the equivalent French, German and Spanish headings). While it is not universally true, most features listed in L are usually offshore in that sense. Aquaculture is usually (but not absolutely always) in 'inshore', ie shallow water and therefore more vulnerable to being hit, so maybe the logic for retaining it in section K just outweighs the logic for moving it to section L.

Clearly and understandably there are mixed views on that. However, given the generally slightly muddled nature of thematic sections, I judge that it is probably best not to move them, in order to avoid unnecessary work, including changing many references in other documents, and possibly including their usage in databases, where a change may have serious consequences.

Headings are easier to change than numbers, so I think the final section of K should be amended to 'Obstructions and Aquaculture'. This will introduce the word 'aquaculture' (in this section and in the index, in accordance with the usage in S-4). It will also cover the current apparent inconsistency of K47 under the heading 'Obstructions'. For compactness, it would be helpful to change the overall heading of Section K to 'Dangers to Navigation' (even though this too results in some inconsistencies, eg K29, K31 and K47 are specifically not dangerous to surface navigation). Another option would be 'Sea Floor Features [and Dangers]'.

### **Conclusions and Recommendations**

The subWG have not reached a conclusion on this issue.

### **Justification and Impacts**

Reorganization of part of INT1 would be achievable at next new edition.

There could be significant impact on related documents and databases as a result of changing INT1 references.

### **Action required of CSPCWG**

The CSPCWG is invited to:

- a. consider all the arguments for and against moving aquaculture symbols from INT1 section K to Section L.
- b. to consider possible changes to headings and sub-headings for Sections K and L.

- c. to advise the INT1 subWG on what further action they should take.