

Comparison S-44 (5th Ed.) with S-57 (CATZOC)

S-44 order	ZOC	Position [m] (95%)	Depth a [m] (95%)	Depth b	full coverage	Objekt size at 10m depth (m)
	A1	5	0,5	0,01	yes	1
	A2	20	1	0,02	yes	1
	B	50	1	0,02	no	uncharted features, hazardous to surface navigation are not expected but may exist
	C	500	2	0,05	no	depth anomalies may be expected
	D	no	large depth anomalies may be expected
Special		2	0,25	0,0075	yes	1
1a		5	0,5	0,013	yes	2
1b		5	0,5	0,013	no	not applicable
2		20	1	0,023	no	not applicable
S-44 order	ZOC	Position [m] (95%)	Depth a [m] (95%)	Depth b	full coverage	Objektsize at 10m depth (m)
Special		2	0,25	0,0075	yes	1
	A1	5	0,5	0,01	yes	1
1a		5	0,5	0,013	no	2
1b		5	0,5	0,013	no	not applicable
	A2	20	1	0,02	yes	1
	B	50	1	0,02	no	uncharted features, hazardous to surface navigation are not expected but may exist
2		20	1	0,023	no	not applicable
	C	500	2	0,05	no	depth anomalies may be expected
	D	no	large depth anomalies may be expected

The bold figures avoid assignment to a better ZOC

Order 1a can only be assigned to A1, if b is better **and** full coverage is assured for **1m** object size

Order 1a can only be assigned to A2, if full coverage is assured for **1m** object size

Order 2 can only be assigned to B, if depth accuracy is reduced by 2% of the depth, only

Object size definition in S-57 appears to me very complex and restrictive

Significant seafloor features are defined as those rising above depicted depths by more than:

	Depth	Significant Feature
a.	<10 metres	>0.1*depth,
b.	10 to 30 metres	>1.0 metre,
c.	>30 metres	>(0.1*depth) minus 2.0 metres

Conclusion:

The declaration of the order alone is insufficient to avoid an unnecessary downgrading in CATZOC
either additional information is necessary or a separate declaration of the CATZOC