



In this example, is the magenta 'no entry' symbol associated with the nature reserve or the firing danger area? But this may be an unusual example, where the green and magenta limits are close.

The magenta symbol is likely to be more prominent and 'urgent' than its green equivalent.

The development of the 'no entry' symbol was originally based upon the red road traffic sign. Magenta in charts is close to red but green is not. Does the use of a green symbol move too far from the intuitive common understanding of the road sign?

INT1 only shows a magenta version on the 'No entry' symbol (N2.2) and also the 'no fishing' and 'no anchoring' symbols, all of which are often associated with ESSA, although in INT1 they are shown with magenta 'T' shaped dashed limits. It may be that the fact that INT1 contains no green examples of these symbols is the reason for not using green, despite the guidance at B-437.2b.

Also, the last sentence of B-437.2b could be leading to the assumption that associated restrictions such as entry, fishing or anchoring prohibited should always be shown in magenta.

## **Conclusions.**

Several conclusions are possible:

1. All symbols associated with an ESSA should be green, including entry prohibited. This accords with the existing instruction and ensures a clear separation between green and magenta features and reduces magenta overload. However, it may be felt that green symbols for restrictions are either not understood or considered to be of less significance than magenta versions.
2. Symbols implying activities prohibited because of the ESSA should be green (anchoring, fishing, diving...) but entry prohibited renders all other restrictions irrelevant to the mariner and so should be in magenta.
3. All symbols implying navigation restrictions should be magenta (entry and anchoring prohibited), but other non-navigational restrictions may be green (fishing, diving).
4. If (2) and possibly (3) is accepted, then the limit should also be magenta.

## **Recommendations.**

CSPCWG should clarify the guidance to ensure consistent application.

### **Depending on the conclusion reached:**

1. The guidance in B-437.2b should always be followed. The last sentence could be misleading and should be deleted (as a clarification).
  - 1.1. There is no need to do anything in INT1, as the symbols are easily recognisable whether green or magenta, or;
  - 1.2. Green versions of the symbols should be added to INT1 (either at N2.2, N20 & N21, or at N22), or;
  - 1.3. A note can be added in INT1 at N2.2, N20 & N21 to state that these

symbols may be coloured green when associated with an environmentally sensitive sea area.

2-3. S-4 will need more extensive amendment. INT1 may need amendment.

**Justification and Impacts.**

1. The avoidance of confusion.
2. Some changes in S-4 and possibly INT1 at next new editions.

**Action required of CSPCWG.**

The CSPCWG is invited to:

Decide which 'Conclusion' is the best.

Advise the actions to be taken as a consequence.