



IHB File No. S3/ 4405

CIRCULAR LETTER 43/2013  
05 July 2013

**REVISION OF THE CHART SPECIFICATIONS OF THE IHO (S-4)  
SECTION B-300 - TOPOGRAPHY**

- References:
- A. IHO Circular Letter 03/2013 dated 14 January - *Revision of the Chart Specifications of the IHO (S-4) - Section B-300 - Topography*
  - B. IHO Publication S-4 Part B - *Chart Specifications of the IHO*

Dear Hydrographer,

1. The Directing Committee would like to thank the following 38 Member States who replied to Reference A that proposed the adoption of the revised Section B-300 of the IHO Chart Specifications: Argentina, Australia, Bahrain, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Croatia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Greece, Iceland, India, Italy, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Ukraine, UK, USA and Venezuela.
2. The Member States' responses and the outcome of their review by the Chair of the Chart Standardization and Paper Chart Working Group (CSPCWG) are provided in the Annex to this letter.
3. Thirty-seven Member States supported the proposed revised specifications and one opposed it. The objection relates to the introduction in clause B-302 of definitions of height and elevation which do not agree with the current definitions in the IHO Dictionary S-32. The definitions of these terms are currently under review by the Hydrographic Dictionary Working Group as requested by the Hydrographic Services and Standards Committee (HSSC). Accordingly, clause B-302 will remain as it stands in the current version of S-4 until the review is concluded and its results are endorsed by HSSC and then approved by Member States, if required.
4. The amended revised specifications, taking into account the comments in Annex A, will be included in the next revision of S-4.

On behalf of the Directing Committee  
Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Gilles Bessero', is written over a light blue circular stamp.

Gilles BESSERO  
Director

Annex A: Member States' Responses to CL 03/2013 and comments from the CSPCWG Chair.

**MEMBER STATES' RESPONSES TO CL 03/2013 AND COMMENTS  
FROM THE CSPCWG CHAIR  
Section B-300 – Topography**

**AUSTRALIA** (answer = Yes):

B-322.1: Suggest start of clause “A breakwater” be in bold text to be consistent with other clauses.

B-325.3: Minor editorial correction: there appears to be a double blank space between “quarantine” and “building”.

B-325.3: The convention used in S-4 is for legends and abbreviations quoted on charts to be in a different (Univers(?)) text font where they are included in the body of a paragraph. Suggest amend text font and size of “Hospital” in the 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph.

B-326.1: Minor editorial correction: there is a double full stop at the end of the 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence. Replace the 2<sup>nd</sup> full stop with a blank space.

B-326.8: Suggest “etc” is not required in the last sentence – amend to read “If the legend ‘Gridiron’ or equivalent is used, it should be in sloping text.”

B-422.9: Incorrect clause number. Amend to B-327.5. Also, as it is in the body of the text, suggest expand “obstn” to “obstruction” in the first sentence.

B-328.3: This clause begins with the text “A crane must be represented by the symbol:”, followed by the symbol F52, but there are a further 2 symbols used in this clause, which is contrary to the “must”. Suggest this sentence be amended to read similar to: “A crane should normally be shown, where required, by:” to be consistent with similar clauses.

B-330: Amend text size and font for text “Hulk” (3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph) to be consistent with other quoted legends.

B-340.3: Suggest amend text font and size for “(red)” and “(2 spires)” in 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph (as per comment for B-253.3 above).

B-340.3: Noting that “(conspic)” is not an international abbreviation, suggest that the first bullet point be amended to read “adding a national abbreviation, eg “(conspic)”, or equivalent, adjacent to the legend;” to be consistent with CSPCWG agreed syntax. Amend text font and size of “(conspic)” for consistency.

B-353.2: The INT1 symbol C20 is repeated in this clause, but the reference in the clause is to the example of C20 at B-353.1. Either remove example of C20 from the clause or amend the reference in the text (suggest remove repeated INT1 example).

B-353.7: The first sentence mandates (“must”) the use of a pattern of small squares to represent salt pans, while an alternative is provided later in the clause. Suggest amend “must” to “should normally”.

B-355.1: Suggest amend text font and size for “Volcanic activity (see Note)” in 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph (as per comment for B-253.3 above).

B-367.1: Suggest amend start of clause to read “On large-scale charts” in bold text (consistency – see clause B-366.1).

B-373.2: Incorrect INT1 reference in last paragraph. Amend “D 10.1” to “E10.1”.

B-373.6: Amend end of clause to read “or, exceptionally, by the *legend* ‘Cemetery’, or equivalent”, for consistency. Amend text font and size of “Cemetery” for consistency.

B-374.4: For consistency, in 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph amend “international abbreviation” to bold text, and amend text font of “Mon” to be consistent with other examples.

B-374.6: Incorrect INT1 reference in 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph. Amend “D 26.1” to “E26.1”.

B-381: Amend beginning of 4<sup>th</sup> sentence to read “Bridge names may be charted ...”.

B-381.3: Suggest “Opening bridges” at start of clause be amended to bold text (consistency). Suggest amend text font and size for “swing”, “lifting” and “opening” in 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph (as per comment for B-253.3 above).

B-381.5: Assuming that the charting of bridge supports for bridges can be treated similarly as for overhead cables (see B-382.1), suggest that the option to use the international abbreviations “Pyl” and “Tr” be included in the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet points, e.g “Add an **international abbreviation**, eg ‘Pyl’, ‘Tr’, or a legend, eg ‘TOWER’, ‘Pylon’ ....”.

*Comment from CSPCWG Chair: Thank you, Australia, for this careful check of detail, including the failure of the Adobe PDF software to convert ‘E’ properly!*

*All suggestions will be incorporated except:*

B-326.8. , since 'etc' is intended to cover other terms, such as careening or scrubbing grid.  
B-422.9 will be transferred to Section B-400 when the new revision containing the revision of B-300 is published.

**FINLAND** (answer = Yes):

Regarding to the specifications in B-302 (reference for heights) Finland will point out that the TR 3/1919 (as amended 2008) will be discussed at the forthcoming TWLWG5 meeting in May 2013 and the meeting will likely propose enhanced specifications, especially related to non-tidal and inland waters.

*Comment from CSPCWG Chair: Changes to IHO Resolution 3/1919 will need to be approved by Member States. Any changes resulting from that approval will be included in the next revision of S-4 if required.*

**FRANCE** (answer = Yes):

1/ The French version of S-4 should take into account the use of the French terms "hauteur", "altitude" and "élévation" which translate the terms "Height" and "Elevation".

*Comment from CSPCWG Chair: This depends upon the further consideration of HDWG.*

2/ France suggests replacing the new wording of paragraph B-307 by:

Marks which indicate distances along a channel (eg nautical miles, kilometres) may be shown where considered useful. The symbol shall be shown either ashore or in the channel. The unit of measurement (M, km, etc) must be shown before the number alongside the symbol. Where marks are visible, symbol, unit and distance figures are in black; a small circle (diameter about 0.5mm) or an appropriate symbol, eg a notice board (Q126), should be used:

B25.2

Where there are no visible marks, symbol, unit and distance figures are in magenta; a small circle (diameter about 0.5mm) should be used:

B25.1

*Comment from CSPCWG Chair: CSPCWG sought to minimize changes from the existing standard, in accordance with our mandate. The order as drafted is considered to be as easily followed as the French proposal.*

3/ In B-313.4, France suggests that the words "height datum" at the end of the first bullet, in "where they are above height datum and", be replaced by "high water" which is the usual term for Chart Datum for objects which are always above water, and as it is designated in the second bullet ("below high water") and in the following sentence. The symbols reference should be F6.1, F6.2 and F6.3.

*Comment from CSPCWG Chair: Agree to amend to High Water. F6.3 should be removed. It is debatable whether dividing 6.1 and 6.2 is useful. This should be considered by INT1 subWG for next editions of INT1.*

4/ France suggests eliminating point c. of paragraph B-324 bearing in mind the simplification of the symbol F23 with the suppression of the use of dotted lines to describe the parts which never dry.

If this proposal is not adopted because the current symbol of dotted lines is to be maintained, France would then suggest to keep the adjective "dotted" of the current edition to describe the type of line to use rather than the term "danger" and a cross-reference to the symbol "(K1)". However, if the dotted lines symbol is common to both cases, the submerged part of a specific installation or a dangerous zone, in the first case the dotted line describes an installation well known to navigators, whereas in the second case, it delimits a largely unknown dangerous zone, into which navigators must not venture. Based on this, the use of the danger line ("danger line (K1)") in the first case does not appear appropriate. In other words, the dotted line symbol is not systematically to be associated with the delimiting of a danger.

*Comment from CSPCWG Chair: The point is well made. Most slips do not extend below the low water line, but where large vessels are launched (eg at shipyards) there may be significant (potentially dangerous) extensions below the low water line. To use a dotted line to show the structure is different from all other structures, so a dashed line (with blue tint) is more consistent (eg as F43). The*

*description for the line will be amended to: 'Any extension beyond the drying line should be delimited by a dashed line and must have shallow water blue tint. A danger line (K1) may be added if required.'*

5/ In B-324.2, France suggests adding “, or equivalent,” after “The legend ‘Ramp’” in the third sentence.

Comment from CSPCWG Chair: Agree.

6/ In B-329.5, France suggests adding “, or equivalent,” after ““(Outer end marked by red lights)”” in the second sentence.

Comment from CSPCWG Chair: Agree.

7/ In B-353.2, France suggests that the symbol C13 which indicates the relief by curved lines be suppressed, as this symbol is no longer to be used.

Comment from CSPCWG Chair: (The reference is to B-352.2) Agree. It should be marked as obsolescent in INT1.

8/ In B-381 and B-381.3, as the symbol D23 does not exist as such but in the form of symbols D23.1 to D23.6, France proposes replacing “D23” by “D23.1 – D23.6” in the text and to add an “s” to the preceding word “symbol”.

Comment from CSPCWG Chair: Agree.

**INDIA** (answer = Yes):

1. B-372.1: Post office is a facility on shore. Therefore the symbol may be retained.
2. B-381.6: Depths (including obstructions) under bridge: this could be applied when the vertical clearance of a bridge is known in a navigable channel. The given example B (source: Japanese Hydrographic and Oceanographic Department) does not show the vertical clearance for the bridges.

Comment from CSPCWG Chair:

1. The post office symbol may be retained as a national symbol. CSPCWG considers they are not useful on INT charts, so the symbol will be marked as obsolescent in INT1.
2. It would certainly be useful if the vertical clearance was stated on the chart, but is not an impediment to using this example to illustrate how to show depths under a bridge.

**ITALY** (answer = Yes):

1) At new point B-125.3 “Position of symbols” is written:

A fixed point, ie, a point whose position has been accurately determined, where not represented by another symbol, must be represented by a small circle with a dot in the middle, generally referred to in these specifications as a ‘position circle’:



The larger position circle, used for conspicuous objects, should be 2mm in diameter. The smaller circle, used for other objects, should be 1mm in diameter. See B-340.5. Where the position circle does not represent a physical feature, then it should be in magenta.

It was formerly the practice to omit the centre dot in the position circle where an object was located only approximately on the chart:



As this small difference was unlikely to be understood by the chart user, this is no longer the practice; the smaller version of B22 should be used. The International Abbreviation ‘PA’ should be placed adjacent to the legend to alert the user to possible positional inaccuracy.

We think there is an inconsistency because we define a fixed point as ...*a point whose position has been accurately determined...* but ...*where an object was located only approximately on the chart...the international abbreviation 'PA' should be placed... to alert the user to possible positional inaccuracy.*

The questions are:

- a) Are we supposed to use the international abbreviation 'PA' for a landmark or for a conspicuous object located only approximately on the chart?
- b) In these cases should we use the smaller version of B22 with 'PA' placed adjacent to the legend of the object?

If the answer is YES we suggest to replace the text highlighted in red with the following text.  
Different examples should be given in S4 and in INT1 at B33.

**Where a landmark or a conspicuous object were located only approximately on the chart they should be represented using the smaller version of B22 rather than the pictorial symbol. The International Abbreviation 'PA' should be placed adjacent to the legend to alert the user to possible positional inaccuracy. e. g.:**

◉ Water Tr PA (not conspicuous and approximately located)

◉ WATER TR PA (conspicuous and approximately located)

◉ Mast PA

*Comment from CSPCWG Chair: I agree that, as drafted, there is some ambiguity. It was not the intention that approximately positioned conspicuous objects should not be charted using a pictorial symbol or the larger positional circle; the important difference is to add 'PA'. The wording will be clarified.*

2) At point B-374 “Chimneys, towers, windmills, wind turbines, flagstaffs” is written:

#### **B-374 CHIMNEYS, TOWERS, WINDMILLS, WIND TURBINES, FLAGSTAFFS**

The following structures are possible landmarks and may be charted, depending on height and the topographic relief, up to several miles inland. The colour may be given, preferably by abbreviations beneath the symbol, as for an aid to navigation.

The structure should be represented by symbols where possible; where space does not allow the use of a symbol, a position circle with appropriate abbreviation or other legend may be used. **Where symbols are used, the true position is the centre of the base of the symbol, see B-125.3.**

For landmark or for a conspicuous object located only approximately on the chart, should not be more comprehensible the international abbreviation 'PA' placed adjacent to the pictorial symbol?



*Comment from CSPCWG Chair: The word 'true' will be deleted. Italy is correct that 'PA' should be added if the position is approximate (see comment above).*

**UK (answer = Yes):**

UK would like to endorse the revision of Section B-300 of IHO Publication S-4 and to highlight the commitment and contribution made by CSPCWG members to the task.

*Comment from CSPCWG Chair: Agree!*

**USA** (answer = No):

B-302. The draft correctly states that “The Hydrographic Dictionary Working Group is reconsidering these definitions in 2013.” The definitions of height and elevation shown in the Circular Letter do not agree with the definitions approved by IHO Member States in Circular Letter 76/2012 and currently posted in S-32 on the IHO website. The definitions shown in the Circular Letter and the proposed text for S-4 are the definitions that were proposed at HSSC4 and have not been approved by HDWG and Member States for inclusion in S-32. Until action is taken by the Hydrographic Dictionary Working Group and by Member States, S-4 should agree with the official definitions approved by Member States in 2012.

*Comment from CSPCWG Chair: The current S-32 definition is not suitable for application to paper charts, resulting in this draft which acknowledges a different application in ENC. As there is an action from HSSC4 on this matter (HSSC4/35 - HDWG to review the approved definitions of Altitude, Elevation and Height, in light of HSSC4-05.9B) and that the new HDWG Chair (Jean Laporte, France) is reportedly considering this issue, B-302 will remain as it stands in the current edition of S-4 until the definitions are discussed further. This action is recommended by IHB.*