

### 13th TSMAD MEETING

18 to 22 September 2006 – Wellington, New Zealand

#### Report to TSMAD and CSMWG summing up replies to TSMAD Letter 03-2006 and CSMWG Letter 01-2006 regarding the proposed S-57 Supplement No1 (Edition 3.1.1)

As at 21 Jul 2006, 12 responses had been received on the above letters. The breakup is as follows:

Organisation	Who	Main comments on
<b>TSMAD replies:</b>		
UKHO	Barrie Greenslade	Proposed <b>CANNOT</b> as new object class for <b>GENOBJ</b>
Japan	Takayuki Kawai	Suggested COLPAT to complement COLOUR (added)
NOAA	Julia Powell	Assigned symbols to be approved by TSMAD/CSMWG before use (included)
Denmark	Carsten Riise-Jensen	Clarifications, but fully agreed
SHOM	Mikael Le Gleau	Full agreement
AHO	Chris Roberts	Full agreement
<b>CSMWG replies</b>		
Previous CSMWG Chairman	Mike Eaton	Concerned that indications and alarms will actually be triggered for Mariner's Objects if plotted for NEWOBJ. Depends on manufacturer.
MGMIO	Dr Lee Alexander	Test and evaluate new proposed symbols, concerned with 'PSSA' and 'ASL' text for area features
Geomod	Pol Le Bihan	Suggests new attribute SYMINT for complex line and area primitives for NEWOBJ
IHB	Michel Huet and Tony Pharaoh	Prefer <b>BEWARE</b> as new object class for <b>GENOBJ</b> , improved wording for proposed ENC Encoding Bulletins (included)
OSL	Jordon Platt	DSID conflict in use of this field with AMLs
SevenCs	Olaf Wentzel	Full agreement

Most of the replies fully agreed with all the questions. The following exceptions or comments were submitted:

#### **Q4: Do you support the idea of another new attribute SYMNAM to provide HOs with the option to specify a particular symbol**

Pol Le Bihan has suggested a companion (or replacement?) attribute SYMINT (Symbol Instruction) which is a description of the symbology instructions, when a complex linestyle or boundary for an area feature is required. Clarification on this matter is still being sought from Pol and will need to be worked out with CSMWG members. The concept of optional symbology has been widely agreed to, it's just the mechanism that now needs refining.

#### **Q6: Do you agree with the new object class name being altered to New Object (NEWOBJ)? If not, please provide reasons below and an alternative suggestion.**

IHB members did not agree with proposed new acronym for NEWOBJ, but suggested **BEWARE** be adopted.

Similarly UKHO did not agree with NEWOBJ and suggested **CANNOT** – Class And Nature Not Otherwise Typed (as in cannot be otherwise defined), but prefers a better object class name.

**Q11: Do you support the new symbology and display categories for the new objects.**

NOAA suggested that if an alternative symbol is required, SYMNAM should be assigned as a joint TSMAD and CSMWG Encoding Bulletin for object class **NEWOBJ**.

Additionally, **OSL** strongly suggest deleting the new class '**GENOBJ**' as this defeats the whole purpose of S-57 (ie: an object-oriented data format). Allowing a 'Generic Object' will allow chart producers an easy way out to just dump objects into this class which has no meaning. There is no way to symbolize this area with any meaning. There is no way to know if the object is dangerous or not. There are ~300 classes in S-57, I prefer to force the chart producer to choose one of these. I provided background to Mr Pratt why we are adoption the NEWOBJ and tried to better explain the proposed symbology options.

Mr Pratt also commented on the proposed ENC PS clause 6.3.2.1 regarding the use of the DSID's COMT field to store data. This field is already being used for NATO Additional Military Layers, but the agreed format is: field = 'data';field = 'data';field = 'data';

He recommended that TSMAD use this style to remain harmonized with AMLs (which also use S-57 as the carrier format). So in this example: STED = '3.1.1'; but since the user can see the COMT field (at least in OSL ECDIS), he further recommended using the full English description: Edition Number of S57 = '3.1.1';

**These issues need to be discussed by members at TSMAD13, or draft a formal proposal to TSMAD13 if you have additional issues with this.**

Additionally **NOAA** suggested remarks be added to the new attributes regarding their approved use. Additional remarks have been added to the 4 new attributes in the attached committee draft.

Dr Lee Alexander (**HGMIO**) reinforced the need to test and evaluate the proposed new symbology. He suggested that a colour fill or pattern may be more suitable than showing the text 'PSSA' or 'ASL'. He also agreed to the addition of ESSA and PSSA to CATREA as a short term solution. The following comments relate to S-100 which may be further considered at SubWg11:

Those attributes pertaining to marine environmental protection, should probably be based on a recognized international classification scheme such as that adopted by the World Conservation Union (IUCN). In particular, IUCN has defined Protected Area as: *"an area of land and /or sea especially dedicated to the protection and maintenance of biological diversity, and of natural and associated cultural resources, and managed through legal or other effective means."* IUCN has defined six (6) protected area management categories based on primary management objective. It would be prudent to have S-57/S-100 attributes for align with these categories. For further info: [www.unep-wcmc.org/protected\\_areas/categories](http://www.unep-wcmc.org/protected_areas/categories)

In addition to the IUCN Protected Area Management categories, the Marine Protected Area (MPA) Center of NOAA (USA) has developed a "Functional Classification Scheme for Marine Protected Areas." This proposed US national system, is intended to supplement (not replace) the IUCN system. The MPA Functional Classification system uses six criteria to objective describe why the site was established, what it is intended to protect, and how it may affect local ecosystems and their associated use. This type of information could be very useful for mariners. For further info: [www.mpa.gov/what\\_is\\_an\\_mpa/](http://www.mpa.gov/what_is_an_mpa/)

NOAA is currently conducting a special project that is looking to develop Coral Reef MIOs based on the IUCN and MPA classification schemes. This effort is being coordinated with HGMIO

The **UKHO** also suggested that a better remark be added regarding the use of INFORM or TXTDSC for the new object classes. These have been added using track changes to the Supplement.

**SevenCs** (Olaf Wentzel) also made a few comments for the S-52 PresLib which have been included in the revised Supplement (OW).

As there were only 2 suggestions for an alternative object class name, **NEWOBJ** has been added to the draft. All changes and additions are shown in blue text in the revised S-57 Supplement No1 (Edition 3.1.1). If anyone feels particularly strongly about an alternative acronym, please make a formal proposal to TSMAD13.

It is suggested that the revised supplement be referred to CHRIS18 for adoption in principle, with the proviso that the additional attribute(s) for **NEWOBJ** driving the optional symbology needs further discussion, testing and resolution by CSMWG members in particular. Members of CSMWG are encouraged to follow the proposals and comment further on the issues still to be resolved regarding the symbology of these-57 object classes, with the aim of presenting an informed proposal to TSMAD13 in Wellington, New Zealand.

Chris ROBERTS  
Coordinator for S-57 Supplement  
Member IHO CSPCWG, CSMWG and TSMAD