



CHART STANDARDIZATION & PAPER CHART WORKING GROUP (CSPCWG)

[A Working Group of the Hydrographic Services and Standards Committee (HSSC)]

Chairman: Peter JONES
Secretary: Andrew HEATH-COLEMAN

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

CSPCWG Letter: 07/2010

UKHO ref: HA317/010/031-07

Telephone:
(Chairman) +44 (0) 1823 337900 ext 3503
(Secretary) +44 (0) 1823 337900 ext 3656
Facsimile: +44 (0) 1823 325823
E-mail: peter.jones@ukho.gov.uk
andrew.coleman@ukho.gov.uk

To CSPCWG Members

Date 30 March 2010

Dear Colleagues,

Subject: CSPCWG6 Actions 10-13 – use of adjective ‘Foul’ (further to Letter 02/2010)

Thank you to 20 CSPCWG representatives who responded to CSPCWG Letter 02/2010. A consolidated summary of the responses is at Annex A. As you will see, there was almost unanimous agreement with the proposals outlined in that letter. Nevertheless, a few representatives provided thoughtful and useful comments and suggestions, which need further consideration. I have added brief comments on these on Annex A (in red).

Australia and New Zealand suggested some improvements to the draft wording at B-422.8, which I am happy to include, except that it would be better to use the singular term. This conforms to the new definition of ‘Foul Ground’ which we expect to be included in the Hydrographic Dictionary in due course (see Steve Shipman’s HDWG response at the end of Annex A).

Several of you suggested omitting the words ‘US usage’ and I agree that is appropriate.

France proposed that the guidance on Foul Ground should be retained with Foul Area. While I accept that there are arguments in favour of that proposal, there are other arguments in favour of the action as agreed at CSPCWG6 and I conclude we should stay with the original plan. S-4 is for compilers and there will be adequate cross references to ensure they are directed to the guidance they need.

INT1, which is for chart users, is a different matter. We agreed to add ‘Foul Area’ at K32. However, on reflection, I wonder if it would be better included in the ‘General’ sub-section as an alternative to K1 (as it really has the same meaning). The existing sub-section K20-31 generally deals with man made sea floor debris (wrecks), whereas ‘Foul Areas’ usually constitute natural obstructions (rocks). I expect the INT1 subWG will consider this further, but you may wish to comment in advance of their June meeting, using the response form at Annex B.

Finally, Canada informed us of their internal specification on this subject, including the use of a national symbol. It is certainly within our normal practice to prefer intuitive symbols to legends so I would be interested to know whether you would consider this symbol (in black) to be a useful addition to INT1.

Please complete and return the attached Response Form at Annex B, **not later than 30 April 2010**.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Peter G.B. Jones', with a date '31/03' written at the end of the signature.

Peter G.B. Jones,
Chairman

Annex A: Consolidated responses to Letter 2/2010.

Annex B: Response Form

CSPCWG6 Actions 10-13 – use of adjective ‘Foul’**Consolidated Responses**andrew.coleman@ukho.gov.uk

CSPCWG6 Action		Yes	No
10	Do you agree with the revisions proposed for S-4? (as noted below)		
	B-411.6: no change	AU, BR, CA, DE, DK, ES, FI, FR, GR, ID, JP, KR, LV, NL, NO, NZ, SE, UA, US, ZA	
	B-420.1: additional clarification in parenthesis (or ‘brackets’)	AU, BR, CA, DE, DK, ES, FI, FR, GR, ID, JP, KR, LV, NL, NO, NZ, SE, UA, US, ZA	
	B-422 title: amended	AU, BR, CA, DE, DK, ES, FI, GR, ID, JP, KR, LV, NL, NO, NZ, SE, UA, US, ZA	FR
	B-422.8: revised to address Foul Areas, rather than Foul Ground	AU, BR, CA, DE, DK, ES, FI, GR, ID, JP, KR, LV, NL, NO, NZ, SE, UA, US, ZA	FR
	B-499.7: new specification, derived from old B-422.8	AU, BR, CA, DE, DK, ES, FI, GR, ID, JP, KR, LV, NL, NO, NZ, SE, UA, US, ZA	FR
12	Do you agree that the Summary statement can be distributed?	AU, BR, CA, DK, ES, FI, FR, GR, ID, JP, KR, LV, NL, NO, NZ, SE, UA, US, ZA	

Comments**AUSTRALIA**

B-422.8: AU agrees with the suggestion from New Zealand, and suggests adding additional text as follows [shown in green]:

B-422.8 A **Foul Area** is an area of numerous uncharted dangers to navigation. It must be delimited by a danger line, see B-420.1. For an area of sea floor debris over which it is safe to navigate (ie Foul Ground), such as the distributed remains of a wreck, see B-449.7.

Chairman’s comment: Agree, but prefer to use singular (Area, not Areas).

Summary Statement: This is an excellent summary of the issue and discussions to date. Regarding the recommendation to HDWG to amend the definition of foul ground – this has been discussed by HDWG on its discussion forum (http://iho-discussions.org/view_forum.php?id=1), and a recommendation along the lines of the CSPCWG recommendation will be prepared for discussion at HSSC2.

CANADA

422.8: Canadian specification for Foul Area includes valuable information that serves to clarify the usage of the symbol. In addition, Canada has a national symbol for a Foul Area to differentiate it with Foul Ground. I have included Canada’s Foul Area symbol below. Consider clarifying the text of specification 422.8 to follow the example of Canada, as follows (except for the bilingual portion of the text, which we must use on our bilingual charts):

FOUL AREA. Areas over which it is unsafe to navigate at any stage of the water level shall be represented by the following symbol.



Larger areas not adequately defined by the symbol shall be identified by the legend "Foul Area/Fond dangereux".

Legends or symbols for foul areas will not be shown if:

- a. there has been no on-site inspection of the area in question or there is no clear evidence of a danger on aerial photographs
- b. the area is foul with weeds and the weed symbol is charted without depths
- c. the area is foul with snags or stumps and the snag symbol is charted
- d. the area is along the shoreline and too small to accommodate a symbol

Chairman's comment: See proposal on response form (Annex B).

FRANCE

Comments for B-422 / B-449.7

FR agrees with the new specification derived from old B-422.8 but does not agree to put it in B-449.7. The subject is too closed and very complementary to the other items of the B-422 paragraph.

Consequently, FR suggests :

- to change the title of the B-422 paragraph to :

B-422 WRECKS, OBSTRUCTIONS, FOUL AREAS and FOUL GROUND

- and to put the new specification derived from old B-422.8 in a B-422.10 paragraph rather than in B-449.7 as it is very complementary to new B-422.8 and B-422.9, and in general, B-420, B-421 and B-422.

Having in the same title FOUL AREAS and FOUL GROUND should be useful to underline the two notions and also to make research easier on these items.

Chairman's comment: For the chart compiler, it is important to distinguish Foul Area (affecting navigation) from Foul Ground (not affecting navigation) as very distinct features and therefore should deliberately occupy different sections of S-4. For the chart user, where there may be potential for uncertainty, it is useful to show the two feature types in the same section of INT1, so that he can easily see the difference. It was also agreed that symbols already allocated numbers in INT1 should not be moved, because of implications to other documents and databases (see CSPCWG6 record 11.2). The discussion at CSPCWG6 acknowledged there were other valid options, including FR's suggestion here, but the consensus at CSPCWG6 was as detailed in the record and has been confirmed by the responses to the letter.

Comments for B-422.8

FR suggests to not precise "(US usage)" in the text of B-422.8 even if US are at the origin of the requirement of this clarification. As S-4 is international standard, it could be ambiguous to precise US usage as the specifications are thought to be international usage. Moreover, I believe that many of CSPCWG members who attended the last meeting agreed with our US colleagues on this matter because they already do themselves more or less this way of doing.

Chairman's comment: Agree

GERMANY

To B-422.8: As we agree to the US usage we should omit the phrase in parenthesis.

To B-449.7: DE sees "sites of cleared platforms" as another examples compared to rests of wrecks or obstructions and lost anchors and therefore this phrase should not overemphasized.

Chairman's comment: Agree, we will remove the emboldened addition, and retain the other reference in the text to cleared platforms. We will also add 'dropped anchors' as another example.

General comments for our further work, especially in the INT 1 SubWG:

DE considers the Foul topic as very important to discuss also in the other WGs and HSSC this year. To prepare the next editions of INT 1 and for the SubWG meeting in June we need more input for perhaps reconstruct the sections around dangerous and undangerous features. As I remember we have planned a new subsection Fouls for INT 1.

At last we need only 4 general symbols to describe foul ground and foul area (point and area) and all cases or combinations can be derived from them.

Chairman's comment: At present the only guidance for INT1 subWG is to include a new item for 'Foul Area' at K32. See letter for further consideration.

JAPAN

After IHO 1st CSC held in 1979, IHO displayed the interpretation and the symbol for a 'Foul ground'. However, Member States used either danger lines or dashed lines for a Foul ground area. They also used either a symbol of # or a danger line circle with 'Foul' text for a Foul ground point.

Afterwards in around 1992, INT1 of M-4 standardized the description of dashed lines and #. However, it did not provide the clear definition about 'navigational safety'. Therefore we adopted and are now using danger lines and #.

The adoption of 'Foul area' may confuse mariners with discrepancies in the interpretation and the symbol. **Chairman's comment:** Agree, and so we are trying to clarify the different meanings of Foul Area and Foul Ground in S-4 and INT1.

Therefore, we need enough time for judgment and rearranging about our 'Foul ground' in terms of the navigational safety.

NEW ZEALAND

It would be helpful to describe the difference between the terms foul area (US Usage) and foul ground in B-422.8. We had not heard the term 'US Usage' relating to foul area before, so it did not help. Moving the definition of foul grounds to a new section leaves B-422.8 still a little unclear. We therefore suggest the following wording for B-422.8:

B-422.8 A **Foul Area** is an area of numerous uncharted dangers to navigation. It must be delimited by a danger line, see B-420.1. For sea floor debris (ie Foul Grounds), such as the distributed remains of a wreck, see B-449.7.

Chairman's comment: Agree, see comment under Australia.

US (NOAA & NGA)

In B-422 add, "The label, "*Foul*" should be added within the area." Explanation: the chart user needs to know why the danger curve exists.

Chairman's comment: See proposal on Response form.

In B-449.7, the reference to B-422.8 is misidentified as Section B-422.9.

Chairman's comment: The cross references seem to be correct, ie to B-422.9 for platforms which remain as obstructions, and to B-422.8 for Foul Areas.

If "Foul Ground" is being removed from the S-4 Section of "Wrecks, Obstructions and Foul Areas", it probably does not belong in INT 1 Section K (Rocks, Wrecks, Obstructions) and probably belongs in INT 1 Section N, ("Areas, Limits"). To remain in INT 1 as K 31, the French response to this letter should be considered.

Chairman's comment: See comment under France.

HDWG (Secretary - S Shipman)

The HDWG, or at least a small group of them, have considered the definitions for “foul area” and “foul ground” as reported in the document you enclosed. The HDWG support the revision of the definition of “foul ground” with the exception that it should be in the singular. We would therefore have:

foul ground: An area over which it is safe to navigate but which should be avoided for anchoring, taking the ground or ground fishing.

Chairman’s comment: Agree.


The HDWG will include this in their report to HSSC.

[Note: see IHO CL 26/10 for proposed changes to TR K3.3 on HDWG working methods].

Response Form


(please return to CSPCWG Secretary by 30 April 2010)

andrew.coleman@ukho.gov.uk

	Question	Yes	No
1	Should the entry for 'Foul Area' be included in INT1 at: a) K1 (as K1.2) b) K32 c) somewhere else (please explain)?		
2	Should a black version of the CA symbol for a Foul Area  be adopted as an International symbol?		
3	Do you agree to expand the guidance for depiction of Foul Areas as below (based on the CA specification)?		
4	Do you agree that the specification for 'stumps' should be moved from B-327.5 to B-422.9 (before the list of cross references)? (These are not topographic features)		

Draft

B-422.8 A **Foul Area** is an area of numerous uncharted dangers to navigation. It must be delimited by a danger line, (K1*, see B-420.1). Further attention may be drawn to the dangers in the area, as appropriate, by:

- Insertion of actual, or a representative selection of, rock symbols (K10-13, see B-421)
- insertion of other dangers eg wrecks, stumps (K43.1, see B-327.5 or B-422.9)†
- insertion of the weed symbol without depths (J13.2, see B-428.2)
- Insertion of the foul area symbol within the area:  (K1.2 or K32)*
- For large areas, addition of a legend '*Foul*' or '*Foul Area*'. (In such areas, the legend Foul Ground must not be used).

For an area of sea floor debris over which it is safe to navigate (ie **Foul Ground**), such as the distributed remains of a wreck, see B-449.7.

* depending on outcome of question 1.

† depending on outcome of question 4.

Comments:

Name:

Member State:

