1 Status of Amendements and Remarks from Pol le Bihan.

place of "symbol name". Logically you need a conditional procedure just to precise that the value of the	Amendement Identifier	Description	ı	Corrections	Remarks
Encoded symbolization Encoded symbols If the "SYMINS" attribute means symbol instruction, the wording in the text must be "symbol instruction" in the place of "symbol name". Logically you need a conditional procedure just to precise that the value of the attribute SYMINS must be applied (if valid). ARCSLN Look Up Tables The area new entry is valid for Plain Boundaries and Symbolised. Symbols No Remarks ASLXIS Look Up Tables No Remarks	Item No.PL03.3.i5.ad.1	NEWOBJ	Default	Look Up Tables	entries are valid for Plain Boundaries and Symbolised, PaperChart and
symbolization & Symbols attribute means symbol instruction, the wording in the text must be "symbol instruction" in the place of "symbol name". Logically you need a conditional procedure just to precise that the value of the attribute SYMINS must be applied (if valid). ARCSLN Look Up Tables The area new entry is valid for Plain Boundaries and Symbolised. Symbols No Remarks ASLXIS Look Up Tables No Remarks				Symbols	No Remarks
ARCSLN Look Up Tables The area new entry is valid for Plain Boundaries and Symbolised. Symbols No Remarks ASLXIS Look Up Tables No Remarks				_	attribute means symbol instruction, the wording in the text must be "symbol instruction" in the place of "symbol name". Logically you need a conditional procedure just to precise that the value of the attribute SYMINS must be applied
ASLXIS Look Up Tables No Remarks		ARCSLN	1	-	entry is valid for Plain Boundaries and Symbolised.
		ASLXIS		Look Up Tables	No Remarks

	ESSA and PSSA	Look Up Tables	The area new entries are valid for Plain Boundaries and Symbolised.
		Symbols	I have not checked the two symbols "ESSA" point symbol and "PSSAESSA" line style.
Item No.CS04.2.d7.co.1	Display of INFORM and TXTDC attribute information for unknown objects	Re Wordings	OK Just the title of the amendment should be "Display of any valid attributes for unknown objects ("ex INFORM or and TXTDC attribute information).
Item No.CS04.2.d7.co.2	Display of unknown objects	The same action as above	No Remarks.
Item No.CS04.2.d7.co.3	Typographical error	Re Wordings	No Remarks (agree).
Item No.PL03.3.d7.co.4	Safety contour detection method	•	No Remarks (agree)
	Depth Contour Procedure		Must not be at this place but OK for a new item and the correction proposed
Item No.PL03.3.d7.co.5	Visualisation of soundings over dangers		I propose to wait that the ENC encoder have populated their data as announced.
Item No.PL03.3.d7.co.6	Visualisation of two non- sectored lights at the same location		I confirm the correction proposed.
Item No.PL03.3.d7.ad.7	Look-up table entry for tideway		No Remarks (agree)
Item No.PL03.3.d7.co.8	Visualisation of soundings over dangers		????
Item No.PL03.3.d7.co.9	Display of OBJNAM for LNDARE point features		No Remarks (agree)

Item No.PL03.3.d7.co.10	Display priority of UNSARE objects	No Remarks (agree)
Item No.PL03.3.d7.ad.11	DGPS reference stations	No Remarks (agree)
Item No.PL03.3.d7.ad.12	AIS symbology	No Remarks
Item No.PL03.3.d7.cl.13	No attribute for distinction between complex line styles	

1.1 DISCUSSIONS ABOUT CSP VALSND

Mike (and Caris Team) doesn't support the VALSND procedure and advice to not visualise danger depth without the danger itself in order to allow the mariner to distinguish between a real sounding and a danger depth.

Mike (and Caris Team) doesn't support the VALSND procedure itself and prefer to change an existing procedures (WRECKSnn and OBSTRNnn).

I agree with the first point. For the second, it is just the way to implement.

What are solutions we have now:

1.1.1 First solution (The simplest)

General comments may be sufficient (we give up the new VALSND procedure) "It is recommended to consider the viewing group 34050 visible as soon as the viewing group 33010 is visible."

1.1.2 Second solution.

Update the proposal VALSND to take into account the first point of Mike.

1.1.3 Third Solution.

We give up the new VALSND procedure and follow the Mike's update on current WRECKSnn and OBSTRNnn procedures.

I have developed a little soft to have a concrete visualisation of the expected result on the screen (see the next page).

I have difficulties to find time to propose the update of the second and third solutions in order to reach the ideal result on the screen (see the next page). And assume that a general advice is sufficient.

:

State of 33010 viewing group "soundings"	State of 34050 viewing group " rocks (UWTROC), wrecks (WRECKS), obstructions (OBSTRN), which are not a danger to own-ship's navigation "	Expected Result on the screen	Changes on Presentation Library (Mike solutions)
visible	visible	11 ₃ 18 ₂ 11 ₃ 18 ₂ 12 ₂ 7 ₁ 26 ₃ 26 ₃	No changes
invisible	visible	*	Add a question in the OBSTRN and WRECKS CSP before display the value of sounding "Is the viewing group 33010 visible?" Remark that depth of dangers are not displayed.
visible	invisible	03 75 113 - 18 ₂ (8 ₈) (71) 12 ₂ 17	Add a general comments in the OBSTRN and WRECKS CSP "the viewing group 34050 must be consider visible as soon as the viewing group 33010 is visible. You can notice that only dangers populated with a value of depth are drawing.

invisible	invisible		No Changes
