

6th CSPCWG MEETING
IHB, Monaco, 1-3 December 2009

Paper for Consideration by CSPCWG

Intervals between symbols in area limits

Submitted by:	CSPCWG Secretary
Executive Summary:	S-4 contains significant inconsistencies in the intervals recommended for inserting symbols in limits, which should be reviewed.
Related Documents:	S-4.
Related Projects:	None

Introduction / Background

Early in the life of CSPCWG we adopted a policy of specifying new symbols as exactly as possible, for improved standardization and for the benefit of software manufacturers. Consequently, whenever a new limit symbol is proposed, we have usually given **guidance** about the interval between the symbols embedded in the limit. During the correspondence exchanges on new symbols suggested at CSPCWG5, some debate arose about the intervals between the 'shell' symbol in the new limit for shellfish beds. The original draft said 'at intervals of approximately 40mm'. This has been amended to 'at intervals of approximately 40mm or closer', at the suggestion of France.

Analysis / Discussion

Examining S-4, we find the following (which may not be exhaustive and excludes other linear, non-limiting symbols such as power cables):

B-431.3	Anchorage areas	approximately 40mm
B-435.2	Precautionary area	approximately 40mm
B-437	ESSAs	not specified
B-439.3	Restricted areas	not specified
B-440.4	Base line	50mm (or closer)*
B-440.5-9	Boundaries	approximately 50mm*
B-441.3	Firing danger areas	50mm (or closer)
B-441.4	Mine practice areas	50mm (or closer)
B-449.6	Seaplane operations	not specified
B-487.2	Radar reference (Ra)	at regular intervals (unspecified)†
B-488.2	Radio reporting line	approximately 40mm†
B-491.1 (draft)	Pilotage areas	approximately 40mm†

* These intervals pre-date CSPCWG revisions.

† These could still be amended, as this section is currently with IHO MS for review.

Conclusions

Inconsistencies in specifying symbol intervals exist. Questions arise:

1. Should we seek greater standardization and consistency and/or recognise the appropriate application of cartographic judgement?
2. How significant is this issue?
3. What impact is there for more automated tools?
4. Does an appropriate interval depend on:

- The nature of the symbol?
- Size of area?
- Other factors?

Options and Recommendations

We can:

1. Leave these as they are, but agree a standard wording for future specifications, eg: 'at regular intervals of xx mm (or closer)', 'approximately xx mm'...
2. We can attempt to standardize all these at the next new edition of S-4. If changed, would this be considered a substantive change and need approval by Member States?
3. Additionally, we could add a generic note in Section B-100 (B-125 or B-127?), eg: 'Where symbols are embedded in linear features, they should be shown at regular intervals, usually not exceeding 50mm but may be closer, particularly on shorter legs'.

Justification and Impacts

Justification improves standardization and reduces confusion for chart compilers and software support partners.

Impacts minor amendments to S-4

Action required of CSPCWG

The CSPCWG is invited to:

1. discuss the issues
2. decide whether the 'standard' interval, if required, should be 40mm, 50mm or other
3. agree a way ahead.