1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)	
Component	CO[1]	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of com-ment[2]	Comment (justification for change) by the CO[3]	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
	Furuno	full document		ge	The issues in the "ENCWG6_2021_EN_6-4_S-52 Clarification 4.0.4" originates from the creation of the portrayal catalogue for the S-101. Any consequential amendment to the S-52 cause easily software upgrade for existing onboard ECDIS based on S-57/S-52	S-101 issues should remain S-101 issue and should not cause consequential amendments to S-52	
	Furuno	1		te	**Date dependent and safety check** Current S-52 PresLib is based on "mariner selected date or date range". The "*ENCWG6_2021_EN_6-4_S-52 Clarification 4.0.4*" propose that this to be changed as:) When performing a safety check during route planning the ECDIS must use the Mariner selected date(s).) The look-ahead function during route monitoring must use the current date. If the S-52 is amended as proposed above then the change is not a clarification, but a new edition 4.1.0 of S-52 PresLib. Further the consequence is that IHO shall inform IMO about the need for software upgrade of existing ECDIS and further IHO & IMO shall agree about transition period for this software change (first date when both ed 4.0.3 and 4.1.0 are valid plus last date of validity for ed 4.0.3). One should note that the mariner selected date or date range has been set intentionally a) Safety checks are related to three items "Planned route", "Monitored route" and "own ship look-ahead check area"	Do not accept the proposal that the "*look-ahead function during route monitoring must use the current date*" Do not change anything in S-52 PresLib Inform S-101 Portrayal-subWG that the S-101 should operate as the current S-52 PresLib 4.0.3	

1   **CO** = Contributing Organisation (HOs should use 2 character codes e.g. FR AU etc.)

2   **Type of comment: ge** = general   **te** = technical   **ed** = editorial

3   Whilst not compulsory, comments are more likely to be accepted if accompanied by a proposed change.

NOTE   Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)	
Component	**CO[1]**	**Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex** (e.g. 3.1)	**Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note** (e.g. Table 1)	**Type of com- ment[2]**	**Comment (justification for change) by the CO[3]**	**Proposed change by the CO**	**Secretariat observations** on each comment submitted
					b) Currently all three checks are based on same information and the permanent indication about current date not included in the date/date-range is valid for all three use cases of safety checks		
					c) The bullet points 1 and 2 make it easy for the mariner to understand what is going on and how the mariner could influence the check process		
					d) What is "current date"? Based on midnight by UTC? Based on midnight by local time zone? Based on midnight by time zone used by onboard (often ship in international traffic use a fixed local time zone for all internal things like working shifts, etc.)?		
					e) What happens when the date change? If the rule is "current date" then obviously the ECDIS software should automatically change the date dependents at midnight for the next day. This kind of automatic functionality has never before required by the ECDIS. Still today the mariner sets the rules.		
					f) Use of "Current date" is not safe for many use cases of the date dependency. Typical for date dependent items is that the things change on a given date, for example		
					o Traffic separation scheme change: the day before the traffic lane is different than today. A single date (being mariner selected or fixed as current date) will only how the traffic lane is in a single individual day. The mariner selected date range is safe to use as the mariner sees both the old and new at		

1 **CO** = Contributing Organisation (HOs should use 2 character codes e.g. FR AU etc.)

2 **Type of comment:**   **ge** = general   **te** = technical   **ed** = editorial

3 Whilst not compulsory, comments are more likely to be accepted if accompanied by a proposed change.

NOTE   Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)	
Component	CO[1]	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment[2]	Comment (justification for change) by the CO[3]	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
					the same time with highlight symbols.		
					o Seasonal aids to navigation are planned to be installed and to be removed on the given date. But actually, the situation may be different i.e. the aids to navigation may still be there or not yet available. Further as this is a physical item, one cannot assume that there is a team to install or remove exactly at midnight. Again the safest is a mariner selected date range.		
					Comments on items to be considered based on "*ENCWG6_2021_EN_6-4_S-52 Clarification 4.0.4*'		
					a) MSC.232(82) 11.2, 11.4.6 - look-ahead function operates independently of the data selected for display		
					o This is not relevant issue as also check of "Planned route" and "Monitored route" operates independently of the data selected for display.		
					b) permanent indication on chart display is required when viewing date does not include current date		
					o This indication is true also for check of "Planned route" and "Monitored route".		
					c) See IEC 61174 4.18 table 3 - "default" selection sets viewing date to current		
					o This is useful even if the S-52 is not changed		
					d) See MSC.232(82) 11.4.2 - single operator action to return to route monitoring - no requirement to change viewing date		

1 **CO** = Contributing Organisation (HOs should use 2 character codes e.g. FR AU etc.)

2 **Type of comment: ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

3 Whilst not compulsory, comments are more likely to be accepted if accompanied by a proposed change.

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)	
Component	CO[1]	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of com-ment[2]	Comment (justification for change) by the CO[3]	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
					o The IMO MSC.232(82) is about the use case when based on mariner settings the own ship is not within the visible display area. The key requirements of IMO are: 1) It shall be possible to get the own ship within the displayed area by single operator action; and 2) that all mariner settings shall be continuous i.e. mariner selections stay as they were when moving to situation "no own ship on displayed area" or when returning to situation "own ship on displayed area"		
	Furuno	2		te	**Text viewing group for the OBJNAM or BRIDGE** The "*ENCWG6_2021_EN_6-4_S-52 Clarification 4.0.4*" claim that "*Viewing group for bridge text is inconsistent ("21" in annex B, "26" in annex C, "21" in DAI for both plain and symbolized boundaries. Should use "26" in all cases.*" Text viewing group 26 contains "Geographic Names" for land areas, sea areas and anchorage areas. Text viewing group 21 contains names of Buoys, Beacons, Daymarks, Light vessels, Light floats and Offshore platforms. I checked my archive 〕 only Ed 4.0.3 of "S-52 PresLib Ed 4.0.2 Part I App C Look-up Table Areas Symbolized Boundaries" include "26" 〕 Ed 4.0.0, 4.0.1, 4.0.2 of "S-52 PresLib Ed 4.0.2 Part I App C Look-up Table Areas Symbolized Boundaries" include 21 〕 All editions of "S-52 PresLib Ed 4.0.2 Part I App	Do not accept proposal that the correct text viewing group is 26. The correct text viewing group for OBJNAM of BRIDGE is 21	

1   **CO** = Contributing Organisation (HOs should use 2 character codes e.g. FR AU etc.)

2   **Type of comment:**   **ge** = general   **te** = technical   **ed** = editorial

3   Whilst not compulsory, comments are more likely to be accepted if accompanied by a proposed change.

NOTE   Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)	
Component	CO[1]	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of com-ment[2]	Comment (justification for change) by the CO[3]	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
					B Look-up Table Areas Plain Boundaries" include 21 ʃ All editions of "DAI-file" include 21 The "26" is looking like a typo in ed 4.0.3		
	Furuno	3		te	**Indication of date dependent objects** The "*ENCWG6_2021_EN_6-4_S-52 Clarification 4.0.4*" claim that "*S-52 provides no display parameters (display plane, priority, etc.) for SY(CHDATD01)*" This true and there is no need to change anything in the S-52. Reason is that S-52 use written textual instruction and the machine-readable DAI-file contains only the "look-up-table part" of the textual description. Clause 10.4.1.1 of S-52 specifies clear drawing instructions as textual description "*All objects for which any of the values for the attributes DATSTA, DATEND, PERSTA PEREND are within the Mariner selected date range shall be indicated using SY(CHDATD01)*"	This issue is not relevant to S-52 as the textual description style do not need machine readable plane, priority, etc. This issue is relevant to S-101, but that does not mean any change to S-52	
	Furuno	4		te	**Drawing priority of SY(INDHLT)** The "*ENCWG6_2021_EN_6-4_S-52 Clarification 4.0.4*" claim that "S-52 4.0.3 DAI has incorrect drawing priority of "8" for instances of SY(INDHLT). Priority is "9" in appendices B-F.)" The ed 4.0.0 had this drawing priority as 8 and the change record in "FOREWORD" for ed 4.0.1 specify that "*Preslib Appendix B/C/D/E/F: Change indhlt display priority to 9*"	The DAI-file should be fixed to reflect the decision made for the ed 4.0.1	

1 **CO** = Contributing Organisation (HOs should use 2 character codes e.g. FR AU etc.)

2 **Type of comment:**   **ge** = general   **te** = technical   **ed** = editorial

3   Whilst not compulsory, comments are more likely to be accepted if accompanied by a proposed change.

NOTE   Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)	
Component	CO[1]	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of com-ment[2]	Comment (justification for change) by the CO[3]	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted

		5		te	**Content of Light Description text when attribute LITCHR do not contain a listed value**
					
					The "*ENCWG6_2021_EN_6-4_S-52 Clarification 4.0.4*" claim that **clause 10.6.3** "Light Description Text Strings" miss instructions what to do when LITCHR (light characteristics) has no value.
					
					Based on S-57 attribute LITCHR itself may not be present or the content of LITCHR may be empty.
					
					Before the textual description style in the October 2014 edition 4.0.0 of PresLIb this detail was specified by a normative C-language procedure LITDSN01.C unchanged at least since 1997 and provided as part of the digital PresLib. Below is the C-language procedure to find out the text for the light characteristics. One can observe that an unknown value of LITCHR causes no change to the output text string "cchr" resulting "nothing added to the light description text string".
					
					void get_characteristic(int ichr,char cchr[10])
					
					{
					
					  switch(ichr)
					
					  {
					
					    case(1): strcpy(cchr,"F"); break;
					
					    case(2): strcpy(cchr,"Fl"); break;
					
					    case(3): strcpy(cchr,"LFl"); break;
					
					    case(4): strcpy(cchr,"Q"); break;
					
					    case(5): strcpy(cchr,"VQ"); break;
						The case is clear for ECDIS OEMs whose products originates before the publishing of the PresLib Ed 4.0.0 in October 2014
						
						Further others could assume that if the table "S-57 Attribute – Light Characteristic" does not provide a value for some numeric value then the result is nothing added to the text string.	

1   **CO** = Contributing Organisation (HOs should use 2 character codes e.g. FR AU etc.)

2   **Type of comment:**   **ge** = general   **te** = technical   **ed** = editorial

3   Whilst not compulsory, comments are more likely to be accepted if accompanied by a proposed change.

NOTE   Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)	
Component	**CO[1]**	**Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex** (e.g. 3.1)	**Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note** (e.g. Table 1)	**Type of comment[2]**	**Comment (justification for change) by the CO[3]**	**Proposed change by the CO**	**Secretariat observations** on each comment submitted
					case(6): strcpy(cchr,"UQ"); break;		
					case(7): strcpy(cchr,"Iso"); break;		
					case(8): strcpy(cchr,"Oc"); break;		
					case(9): strcpy(cchr,"IQ"); break;		
					case(10): strcpy(cchr,"IVQ"); break;		
					case(11): strcpy(cchr,"IUQ"); break;		
					case(12): strcpy(cchr,"Mo"); break;		
					case(13): strcpy(cchr,"FFl"); break;		
					case(14): strcpy(cchr,"Fl+LFl"); break;		
					case(15): strcpy(cchr,"AlOc Fl"); break;		
					case(16): strcpy(cchr,"FLFl"); break;		
					case(17): strcpy(cchr,"AlOc"); break;		
					case(18): strcpy(cchr,"AlLFl"); break;		
					case(19): strcpy(cchr,"AlFl"); break;		
					case(20): strcpy(cchr,"Al"); break;		
					case(25): strcpy(cchr,"Q+LFl\0"); break;		
					case(26): strcpy(cchr,"VQ+LFl"); break;		
					case(27): strcpy(cchr,"UQ+LFl"); break;		
					case(28): strcpy(cchr,"Al"); break;		
					case(29): strcpy(cchr,"AlF Fl"); break;		
					}		
					}		

1   **CO** = Contributing Organisation (HOs should use 2 character codes e.g. FR AU etc.)

2   **Type of comment:**   **ge** = general   **te** = technical   **ed** = editorial

3   Whilst not compulsory, comments are more likely to be accepted if accompanied by a proposed change.

NOTE   Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

Date: 8th Jun 2021	Document: **ENCWG6_2021_EN_6-4_S-52 Clarification 4.0.4**

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)	
Component	CO[1]	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of com- ment[2]	Comment (justification for change) by the CO[3]	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
	Furuno	6		te	**Both S-52 main document and S-52 Annex A, Presentation library include a false statement about IMO display category of text** The "*ENCWG6_2021_EN_6-4_S-52 Clarification 4.0.4*" claim that there are false statements ⟩ **Clause 2.2.3c** of IHO S-52 main document edition 6.1.1 specify "*The IMO Display Category for text is "other"."* ⟩ **Clause 9.1** of S-52 Annex A, Part I, Presentation library edition 4.0.3 specify "*All text is in the IMO Category "Other Information"."* So called "IMO Display Categories" are "Display Base", "Standard Display" and "Other" The observation of the "*ENCWG6_2021_EN_6-4_S-52 Clarification 4.0.4*" is true as the display of text is independent of the "IMO Display Category". Actually, there is no "IMO display category" for the text. Display of text is sub-divided by "Text Groups" (see clause 14.4). The connection between text and "IMO Display Category" is indirect – namely text is displayable only if the related object itself is displayed and the display of the object itself is controlled by the "IMO Display Category". If the text is displayable then the display of text or no display of text is controlled by the mariner on/off selections for the text groups. Both S-52 main document and from S-52 Annex A, Part I, Presentation library document this detail: ⟩ **Clause 2.2.3c** of IHO S-52 main document edition 6.1.1 specify "*As a guide to adding and removing text from the display, the Presentation*	The false statement could be removed from both S-52 main document and from S-52 Annex A, Part I, Presentation library	

1   **CO** = Contributing Organisation (HOs should use 2 character codes e.g. FR AU etc.)

2   **Type of comment:**   **ge** = general   **te** = technical   **ed** = editorial

3   Whilst not compulsory, comments are more likely to be accepted if accompanied by a proposed change.

NOTE   Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)	
Component	CO[1]	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of com-ment[2]	Comment (justification for change) by the CO[3]	Proposed change by the CO	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
					Library distinguishes between "Important text" and "Other text." Suggested groupings for text display are provided in the Presentation Library, Part I, section 9.1 and Table 14.4."		
					ʃ **Clause 9.1** of S-52 Annex A, Part I, Presentation library edition 4.0.3 specify "*The display of text must be controlled independently of the display of the object it applies to and the Mariner must have full control over the display of text. As a guide to organizing the display of text, the last two digits of the SHOWTEXT instruction give a text classification that distinguishes between "Important" and "Other" text, and gives further suggested text groupings.*"		
	Furuno	7		te	**Double M_COVR in cell AA5C1CDE of ECDIS chart 1** The "ENCWG6_2021_EN_6-4_S-52 Clarification 4.0.4" claim that "*It has been identified that cell AA5C1CDE has two overlapping M_COVR objects with attribute CATCOV = {1} (coverage available)*". This claim has been verified to be true by the R&D of Furuno	Remove the second overlapping coverage object from the cell AA5C1CDE	

1 **CO** = Contributing Organisation (HOs should use 2 character codes e.g. FR AU etc.)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

3 Whilst not compulsory, comments are more likely to be accepted if accompanied by a proposed change.

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.