INTERNATIONAL HYDROGRAPHIC ORGANIZATION

ORGANISATION HYDROGRAPHIQUE INTERNATIONALE

CHART STANDARDIZATION & PAPER CHART WORKING GROUP (CSPCWG)

[A Working Group of the Committee on Hydrographic Requirements for Information Systems – CHRIS]

Chairman: Peter JONES
Secretary: Andrew HEATH-COLEMAN

UK Hydrographic Office
Admiralty Way, Taunton, Somerset
TA1 2DN, United Kingdom

Telephone:
(Chairman) +44 (0)1823 723343
(Secretary) +44 (0) 1823 337900 x 3057
Facsimile: +44 (0)1823 325823
E-mail: peter.jones@ukho.gov.uk
andrew.coleman@ukho.gov.uk

CSPCWG Letter: 01/2006

UKHO ref: HA317/010/031-04 & HA317/010/034-04

To CSPCWG Members

Date 8 February 2006

Dear Colleagues,

Subject: Summary of Responses to CSPCWG Letter 15/2005

We are grateful to 13 WG members who responded to CSPCWG Letter 15/2005, which invited confirmation of decisions taken at the 2nd CSPCWG meeting, in October 2005. Annex A shows how the members responded. A summary of the way forward for each question follows:

1. We are grateful to those members who have contributed some papers to will help us draft a Maintenance section for M-4, when opportunity allows. CSPCWG2 Action 2 is now formally closed; nevertheless, we will be happy to receive any further contributions.
2. The draft guidance for portraying maritime limits will now be included in the draft revision of B-430. This will provide further opportunity to refine these, as requested by France.
3. We have received several papers on chart colours. They are all very different in format and it is not yet clear whether we can prepare a usable annex from them.
4. The symbol for a reporting line received unanimous approval. It will therefore be included in M-4 and INT 1 in accordance with the Work Plan, taking note of the comments by Australia, or earlier if opportunity arises.
5. We have advised UK's General Lighthouse Authority of our thinking regarding the abbreviation 'sync' and they will take it up with IALA on our behalf. Meanwhile, P66 seems to be the preferred position in INT 1.
6. No further action required.
7. The DGPS symbol will be inserted in INT 1 at S51 at the next revision, with the specification being inserted in M-4 at B-481.5 in accordance with the Work Plan, or earlier if opportunity arises.
8. Boulders will be included in the revision of B-400 to B-429, soon to be released for MS endorsement.
9. The format for geographical positions will be included in the next release of M-4.

In our email of 21 December 2005, we requested WG members to advise any intention to offer a venue for the 3rd CSPCWG meeting, in accordance with CSPCWG2 Action 40. Once again, only Australia has offered to host the meeting, for which we are grateful. However, recalling that last year we found that very few members were able to travel to Australia, I have decided that it would be better to continue to use the excellent facilities in Monaco. **This meeting is now scheduled for 22-24 November 2006. Please therefore note your diaries and plan your budgets accordingly**.

Yours sincerely,

Peter G.B. Jones,
Chairman

Annex A: Combined responses to CSPCWG Letter 15/2005

COMBINED RESPONSES TO CSPCWG LETTER 15/2005

Paragraph Number		Yes	No
1	Do you have any guidance on chart maintenance which you can make available for consideration in the development of a future section of M-4? (If yes, please supply to Secretary by 26 January 2006).	AU, DE, DK, ES, FR, UK	BR, CA, FI, JP, NL, NO, US[1], ZA
2a	Do you agree with the New Principles for Portraying Maritime Limit at Annex D to the CSPCWG2 Report?	AU, BR, CA, DE, DK, ES, FI, FR, JP, NL, NO, UK, US, ZA	FR[2]
2b	Do you agree with the suggested location in M-4 (B-439)?	AU, BR, CA, DE, DK, ES, FI, FR, JP, NL, NO, UK, US, ZA	
3a	Do you agree that including examples of colour values in an Annex to M-4 B-100 is a good idea?	AU, BR, CA, DE, DK, ES, FI, FR, JP, NL, NO, ZA	US
3b	Is your office willing to make its colour values available for publication in such an annex? (If yes, please supply to Secretary).	AU, DE, DK, FI, FR, NL, NO	BR, CA, ES, JP, US, ZA
4	Do you agree to approve Germany's national symbol for a Reporting line (Mg) as an INT symbol? Dimensions of German symbol: circle diameter 1.85mm, triangle base 1.15mm, height 1.50 mm.	AU[3], BR, CA, DE, DK, ES, FI, FR, JP, NL, NO, UK, US, ZA	
5a	Do you agree to the use of '(sync)' as an INT abbreviation to mean 'synchronized or sequential lights'?	AU[3], CA, DE, DK, ES, FI, FR, JP, NL, NO, UK, US, ZA	BR
5b	If yes, where do you suggest it should be located in INT1? (eg P15.2, P56 or P66 + V & W)	See 2 below	
6	Do you agree that no special chart symbol is required for charting oscillating Port Entry Lights?	AU, BR, CA, DE, DK, ES, FI, FR, JP, NL, NO, UK, US, ZA	
7a	Do you agree that a radio circle with 'DGPS' legend should be approved as a symbol for use?	AU, BR, CA, DE, DK, ES, FI, FR, JP, NL, NO, US, ZA	UK
7b	Do you agree with the suggested location in INT 1 (S51)?	AU, BR, CA, DE, DK, ES, FI, FR, JP, NL, NO, UK, US, ZA	
7c	Do you agree with the suggested location in M-4 (B-481.5)?	BR, CA, DE, DK, ES, FI, FR, JP, NL, NO, UK, US, ZA	AU[3]
8	Do you agree to the use of the abbreviation *Bo* to be used for Boulders in intertidal areas?	AU[3], BR, CA, DE, DK, ES, FI, FR, JP, NL, NO, UK, US, ZA	
9	Do you agree to standardize the format for quoting geographical positions on charts as Annex B?	AU[3], BR, CA, DE[4], DK, ES, FI, FR[5], JP, NL, NO, UK, US, ZA	

2. Suggested locations for 'sync' in INT 1:

P15.2	P56	P66
No support	CA, JP, ZA	AU, DE, DK, ES, FI, FR, NL, NO, UK, US

Notes:

[1] US is NOAA.

[2] FR comment (also supported by DK):

We need more time to study the Principles. They should be improved by guidance on what should be emphasized and in which cases tint band should be used. M4 does not specify the use of the tint band. Perhaps, M4 should do it for certain objects or situations.

Principles recommend bolder and longer dashes (or T shaped dashes) which do not exist as INT symbols.

I'm not sure that restrictive limits have always precedence over non-restrictive limits (for example, a regulated fairway is perhaps more important to show than the associated access restriction for small crafts – restriction for small crafts could be partially deduced by users in this case). It depends on the different users point of view.

I think that when working on fairway areas (action 11), we will set up new portrayals and clarifications about issue of coincident limits. It would be wise to wait work on fairway areas.

[3] AU comments:

4: distance apart of radio reporting symbols (along the line) is suggested to be added to the specification at about 25 mm intervals. We have agreed to supply full specifications for all new symbols.

5a: AU agrees to the 'sync' abbreviation being added to the specifications provided it is not mandatory to show this on the paper chart. That is, the strength or wording used is 'may' or 'should', not 'must' *[tagged for revision of B-478.3 – Secretary]*. AU will include such information in the lights list but will not be showing this information on its paper charts as it will cause further clutter and drive additional NtM action.

7c: Radiobeacons have traditionally been used on charts for the specific use of determining a bearing or course (as defined by S-32). Although DGPS fits the S-32 definition (for locating your vessel), this does not fit precisely with the charted radiobeacons to date. As AU cartographers have limited experience with radiobeacons, we are not totally disagreeing with the replacement of B-481.5 and will agree with other members if they think this is the better way to have it added to M-4. An alternative to B-481 is B-490 Marine Services and Signal Stations. If we adopted B-490.5 as a marine service, we could leave B-481.5 as a more generalised statement with perhaps an alternate example (not Omega). It was noted that B-481.5 has already been removed in the IHO website version of M-4.

8: Abbreviation Bo should be used to indicate the nature of the seabed (B-425). It should also be added to INT1 V & W. However CSPCWG2 Action 26 only mentions the visually conspicuous always dry example of a boulder. The AU paper CSPCWG2-8.9 Rev.1 and charted examples, provided examples of prominent and visually conspicuous intertidal boulders and there has been no action recorded to add a suitable section to B-400 (not picked up at the meeting by AU). Perhaps this can be added or reviewed in the Round 4 of the B-400-429 (Action 30), but as members of CSPCWG are reviewing this topic, it has been raised here as it is directly related to the use of 'Bo' (or BO when conspicuous). If the CSPCWG agrees to the abbreviation Bo being used to indicate such features on the paper chart, it must only be used to indicate a prominent or visually conspicuous boulder and the abbreviation must only be used when there is insufficient room for the full text or if the chart is congested in the area (which is often

the case). It is suggested that this type of statement should be part of the specification if all members agree to the abbreviation. AU has now refined the proposed wording for the specifications and suggests that an additional sentence be added to B-421.2 to the affect that:

'Intertidal boulders may also exist on intertidal rock or coral ledges and these may be indicated with accompanying text Boulder or Bo, or in bold italic capital letters 'BOULDER' if visually conspicuous (see B-340).' It is suggested that a diagram be added to show the symbol * with text for an intertidal boulder. *[A short sentence will be added to B-421.2. A diagram is considered unnecessary for such a rare feature as an intertidal and possibly movable boulder which is considered to be conspicuous – Secretary]*

The issue of boulders on land (always dry) can be reviewed when we review B-300. You may like to tag this Andrew, possibly in B-312 and B-340 *[done – Secretary]*.

9: It is suggested that if adopted for M-4, there needs to be an IHO CL to all MS to standardise its use throughout hydrography, not just on paper charts. This may involve slight amendments to other IHO publications as well or may be suitable as an IHO Technical Resolution? I don't know how this would be processed?

[4] DE comment:

For NM corrections we have to use German DIN 13312:2004 which follows ISO 19018:2004. That means leading zeros also for degrees (latitude 00° ... 90°, longitude 000° ... 180°). Because of space limitations we don't use these leading zeros in the chart borders and therefore we agree to the format discussed at CSPCWG2

[5] FR supported by DE, DK and NO:

request that with regard to the decimal separator, it could be noted that the comma is the ISO preferred sign *[will be included in the IHO CL submission to MS – Secretary]*.