

**INTERNATIONAL HYDROGRAPHIC
ORGANIZATION**



**ORGANISATION HYDROGRAPHIQUE
INTERNATIONALE**

IHB File No. S3/4405

**CIRCULAR LETTER 48/2006
22 June 2006**

**REVISED SECTION B-400 OF THE
CHART SPECIFICATIONS OF THE IHO (M-4)**

- References:
- 1) Circular Letter 30/2006 dated 8 March 2006
 - 2) Circular Letter 121/2005 dated 6 December 2005
 - 3) Circular Letter 86/2005 dated 31 August 2005
 - 4) Circular Letter 47/2006 dated 9 June 2006
 - 5) Publication M-4 – Part B: Chart Specifications of the IHO

Dear Hydrographer,

The Circular Letter in reference 1 announced that the IHO Chart Standardization and Paper Chart Working Group (CSPCWG) had completed a revision of Specifications B-400 to B-429 of M-4 and that it was available on the IHO website for Member States to examine. The CL also proposed a standard format for geographical positions (based on ISO Standard 6709), and new symbols for a reporting line and a Differential GPS station.

The Bureau thanks the following 12 Member States who responded, all expressing their support of the CSPCWG's revision and proposals, which are therefore approved: Australia, Chile, Denmark, Ecuador, France, Italy, Japan, Norway, Peru, Spain, UK and USA. Additionally, Australia raised a number of minor issues, as reflected in the Annex, which have been forwarded to the CSPCWG for further consideration.

Version 3.002 of M-4 was placed on the IHO website (www.iho.shom.fr > Publications > Catalogue > M-4) at the end of 2005, as reported in the CL in reference 2. A new version 3.003, incorporating the approved revision of Specifications B-400 to B-429, as well as the agreed standard format for geographical positions (Spec. B-131), and taking into consideration the issues raised by Australia, will now be prepared by the CSPCWG. It will then be posted on the IHO website.

Germany, as producer of IHO INT 1 (English), is kindly requested to consider issuing amendments to INT 1 (2005 Edition – CL in reference 3 refers), following the approval of new symbols for a reporting line (M40.2) and a Differential GPS station (S51). These changes to INT 1 will then be described on the IHO website (CL in reference 4 refers).

The relevant changes will be made to the French and Spanish versions, which will be available in due course.

The CSPCWG is currently revising Specifications B-430 to B-439. The other remaining sections of B-400 will follow. Member States are invited to continue contributing to this work through their representatives on CSPCWG.

On behalf of the Directing Committee
Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "K. Barbor". The signature is written in a cursive, somewhat stylized font. To the left of the signature, there is a vertical line that extends upwards from the signature area.

Rear Admiral Kenneth BARBOR
Director

Annex : Australia's comments in reply to CL 30/2006.

Responses to CL 30/2006

Comments by Australia

2003/2500007/02
HYDRO 070/06

Rear Admiral K. Barbor
Director, IHB
4, quai Antoine 1er
B.P. 445 – MC 98011 MONACO Cedex
Principauté de Monaco

Dear Ken,

IHO CL 30/2006 – Revised Section B-400 for Chart Specifications of the IHO (M-4)

1. Australia is an active member of the CSPCWG and has participated in the previous four rounds of reviewing M-4-B400 to 429 inclusive. Overall I support the adoption of the revised section of the Chart Specifications, but raise the following minor issues for further consideration. When reviewing these proposals, please refer to Version 3.003 draft March 2006 of B-400 to 429 and also to INT 1, BSH version Feb 2005:

B-411 the depth contour lines in the graphic for I30 have not plotted from the digital pdf file.

B-411.2 the recommended line specifications (4 mm length with 2 mm spaces) does not correspond with either graphic example provided (I31). It is suggested that at least one example should agree with the specification for the recommended portrayal of approximate depth contours.

B-411.3 The first sentence states that all contours in the series charted **must** be labelled, then in the third sentence, there is an exception where contours need not be labelled. In accordance with the 'strength of wording in B-120.4, the term 'must' be in the first sentence, should read 'should'.

B-413.3 This natural watercourse within an intertidal area is known as a Tideaway in S-57 and has its own object class **TIDEWY**. To help cartographers identify this feature and provide a cross reference for ENC compilers, it is suggested that the term tideway be added to this section. Suggested wording is: "**A natural watercourse** in intertidal areas, eg formed by the outflow of a stream or by tidal action, **also known as a tideway**, should be charted by..."

B-414 Dredged areas: the three graphic examples provided infer that dredged areas do not contain shallow water blue tints (see B-411.6) as there is no mention of tints in these areas. However as discussed by CSPCWG, dredged areas do contain blue tint corresponding to the rest of the chart and in the graphics, at least the areas dredged to 3.5 metres, should portray blue tint. To make this point absolutely clear, it is suggested that consideration be given to amending the first sentence to read: 'Dredged channels and areas must be delimited by dashed lines **with blue tint in shallow water in accordance with B-411.6**. The dredged depth...'. INT 1 may also require an example to highlight this specification.

B-417.1 second last sentence within the last paragraph, suggest adding the word 'may' as follows: "...from a relatively small coastal survey **may** have to be used."

B-420 Dangers: the introduction includes the following sentence "The fullest possible information on clearance depths must be given irrespective of their depths, in preference to making any

arbitrary distinction between 'dangerous' and 'non-dangerous' depths." Section B421.4 then provides 5 examples of the methods for portraying 'dangerous' and 'non-dangerous' depths over rocks. The first 4 examples for dangerous depths provide 2 sets of choices for dangerous underwater rocks. I am of the view that the chart symbols need to be distinct and reduce the number of choices in displaying dangerous hydrographic features in particular. Mariners need to get accustomed to the symbols used to portray dangerous feature. Providing choices only leads to confusion by the mariner and reduces his recognition of particular 'dangers'. There is no clear distinction between K14.1 right option, which is supposedly 'dangerous' to K15 which is supposedly 'non-dangerous'. When creating ENCs from paper charts, there needs to be a clear distinction between dangerous and non-dangerous, to permit the S-57 attribute 'category of wreck', to be encoded correctly (value 1=non-dangerous, value 2 = dangerous). It is suggested that all dangerous underwater rocks be clearly distinguished without a choice of symbols, being the first options for K14.1 and the second option for K14.2. This will then provide a visual distinction from K15 which is non-dangerous.

B-421.5 The second last sentence makes reference to B-417.8 which does not exist. The reference should be B-417.

B-422b: if the last sentence in this section is approved, the wording in the official IHO version of INT 1 K29 will require amendment.

B-422h: add reference to B-424 at end (missing).

B-422.1 K23 example, should read "(depth unknown, **but considered to be dangerous**)" to be consistent with B-421.4a and B-422.6 example K28. If not considered dangerous, it would have no blue tint and such a wreck could exist in a deep hole on a large scale chart. (Note that INT 1 K22 shows both examples with and without blue tint, but no indication that the blue wreck is dangerous).

B-422.2 The depth next to the K25 symbol should be a drying height in accordance with the text which says "height or drying height". There is no mention of a depth.

B-422.4 introductory bold text is very verbose. It could be simplified without altering the meaning to; "**A wreck over which the least depth has been determined by sounding, must be shown...**".

B-422.6 The text referring to K28 is incomplete. Suggested text is "...and solid blue tint must be added **in waters less than 100 metres deep (see B-411.6).**"

B-422.7 the last sentence to the second bullet iii sets a precedent to reduce the size of symbols. AU does not support this new precedent and we should be aiming for standardisation whenever possible. If France or another HO wished to do this, they can make a national rule.

B-422.9 As stumps of posts and piles are generally potential obstructions to navigation, it is suggested they should be removed from B-327.5 and included in B-422.9. This is also consistent with INT 1 K43 under the heading of obstructions. A cross reference could then be added in B-327.3 to B-422.9. This has been raised now to try and prevent a further version of B-400 after B-300 is reviewed.

B-425.5 The comments for J13.1 are not aligned. It needs to be dropped down slightly.

B-426.2 and B-426.3 both contain a phrase "even when it continues underwater". This infers that the rock or coral edge symbols continue below the LWL. When the original version of M-4 was checked, the intension is quite different and it states: "low water line where it continues below the LWL". This implies that the rock or coral edge symbols form the LWL. As B-421.5 describes the symbology for underwater coral reefs as a

different symbol to intertidal coral, the original wording confirms the intent. It is suggested that both B-426.2 and B-426.3 be re-worded to clarify this situation. Suggested wording for B-426.2 is: **Rocky areas** (see also B-421, Rocks). The rock edge symbol (shown below) must be used to show the drying limits of **all intertidal** rocks.

B-428.2 It is suggested that at the end of this section, a reference to B-425.5 J13.1 be added. There is however no direction provided in these specifications when the abbreviation 'Wd' should be used in preference to the symbol J13.2 (or vice versa). It is suggested that this matter be clarified in B-428.2.

Suggested wording is: The abbreviation "Wd" must only be used for isolated occurrences of kelp when found by bottom sampling (see B-425.5 J13.1).

If this is agreed to, it is further suggested that the comment to B-425.5 J13.1 be altered to '(including **occurrences** of Kelp, see B-428.2).' This will make the distinction clearer, i.e. areas of Kelp, use J13.2 or a legend, isolated Kelp found when bottom sampling, use the abbreviation 'Wd'.

2. AU also agrees to the standardisation of the proposed format for geographical positions, and to the new symbols for a reporting line and a differential GPS station, for both M-4 and INT1 as proposed in Annex B to the CL.
3. In the check of this section of B-400, several cross referencing errors were found within B-290. In M-4 Version 3.002 November 2005, the whole section B-290 contains many references to B-170 sections, which have now been removed from B-100 Version 3.002. Suggest a global search of B-290 and correct all the B-170 references.
4. The CSPCWG and its Chairman and Secretary in particular, are to be congratulated on their patience and attention to detail in the review of these complex yet fundamental charting specifications.

Yours sincerely

Original signed by

R. NAIRN
Captain, RAN
Hydrographer of Australia

Tel: (02) 4221 8500

09 May 06