

**13th TSMAD MEETING**  
18 to 22 September 2006 – Wellington, New Zealand

**Update to CSMWG Report relating to the S-57 Supplement No1**

Reference: TSMAD13-9.1 (Rev 1)

A second CSMWG letter was sent out to all CSMWG contacts (including many ECDIS manufacturers) explaining the proposed new optional attributes to symbolize the **NEWOBJ** which is part of the separate paper TSMAD13-6.3.

In the CSMWG Letter No2, the following questions were asked:

| No. | Description   | Yes | No |
|-----|---|-----|----|
| 1   | Do you agree to <u>replace</u> the proposed new attribute SYMNAM with SYMINT (or alternative name).   |     |    |
| 2   | Do you agree with the revised acronym for symbol instruction being SYMINS (acronym for symbol instruction). If not, please provide an alternative with reasons.                 |     |    |
| 3   | Do you agree with CSMWG having to pre-approve the symbol instruction if a hydrographic office wishes to portray alternative symbology to the defaults for <b>NEWOBJ</b> .       |     |    |
| 4   | Do you agree with the revised remarks for the S-57 Use of the Object Catalogue regarding symbol instructions in Annex A. If not, please provide revised wording or suggestions. |     |    |

The closing date for comments has now passed and the following is a summary of the responses. All addresses were advised that no response would be taken as agreement to the questions:

Only 4 responses were received and were from Australia, CARIS, SevenCs and NOAA. Three fully supported all questions with CARIS agreeing to the first three and making a suggestion for additional wording in the UOC as follows:

“Note that there are separate symbol names for point, simple and complex lines, ~~and~~ area and text symbology”.

I believe that the presentation library only has named point symbols, complex line styles and Area patterns. Others are defined on a parameter basis.

The proposed revised wording to the S-57 Use of the Object Catalogue within the S-57 Supplement No1 is:

- This object class has default symbology in the S-52 Presentation Library Edition 3.4 (and later editions), however for features that are considered hazardous to navigation, the HO may propose an existing symbol from the S-52 Symbol Library to portray the feature more accurately on an ECDIS. If the SYMINS ~~and~~ ~~or~~ SYMNAM attributes ~~are~~ ~~is~~ populated with a valid symbol instruction or symbol name, this will override the default symbology. Note that there are separate symbol names for point,

simple and complex lines, and area and text symbology. The attributes SYMINS and SYMNAM must not be used without the joint authority of TSMAD and CSMWG.

The following comment was also made by CARIS:

This is interesting and powerful. It is a reasonable solution to provide a new object and define how to show it to avoid new presentation libraries. Essentially these objects will become cartographic objects because they include a single presentation instruction. The ECDIS systems will need to be updated, at least once, to be able to detect the SYMINS instruction and apply it and then new presentation libraries won't need to be issued every time a new object is added. I think the SYMINS solution will provide more flexibility for different presentations as well as make it more machine usable.

Roberts' background comment: S-57 Version 2 included cartographic object classes \$CSYMB, \$LINES and \$AREAS which all had the attribute \$SCODE which was populated with an INT1 reference such as IQ123 for a cable landing beacon.

Comment from AU relating to Q3 above was: the safest approach is to have CSMWG pre-approve the use of optional symbology.

New actions for consideration and approval of TSMAD13 are as follows:

1. For **NEWOBJ**, delete the proposed attribute SYMNAM as it has been completely superseded by the amended attribute SYMINS.
2. Adopt SYMINS as the acronym for the new optional attribute Symbol Instruction. Revise the wording to the SYMINS remark to include CARIS suggestions above and consider the additional remark drafted by Roberts (also in red)
3. Approve the revised wording to the S-57 Supplement No1 for the Use of the Object Catalogue.

Additionally, there appears to be agreement amongst the CSMWG executive at least, that the colour of the default point symbol for **NEWOBJ** should be toned down a bit to be slightly less bold than the CHMGD full magenta colour in TSMAD13-6.3 (SY(GENOBJ01)).

Other actions for consideration by CSMWG:

4. Consideration be given to altering the symbol name SY(GENOBJ01) to SY(NEWOBJ01) to agree with the S-57 Supplement No1 object class. Colour of this symbol be less bold.
5. Adopt the 'second approach' presented to TSMAD and prepare an immediate amendment for all symbols and other issues resulting from S-57 Supplement No1 (in anticipation of CHRIS approval).
6. Sections 6.1.1 and 6.1.2 in the S-57 Supplement make reference to point **CNTARE** for ESSAs and PSSAs. If TSMAD agrees, this will not be permitted for ESSAs and PSSAs as they will all be encoded as **RESARE**.
7. In section 6.1.4 SY(PSSARE01), SevenCs suggest this should be called (PSSATEXT).
8. In section 6.2.14, for LC(ASLARE01), SevenCs suggests it be called LC(ARCSLN01)
9. In section 6.3.1, GENATT01 may need to be renamed to NEWATT01 or something similar to correspond with the new S-57 object class.

The paper TSMAD13-6.3 has now been updated to include the proposals of the CSMWG (in red). Note that all the proposed editorial corrections made in TSMAD13-6.3 have not been highlighted or colour coded in this new version 7 of the Committee Draft dated 30 August, 2006 (new paper TSMAD13-6.5).

These papers (TSMAD13-6.4 and 6.5) have been circulated to both TSMAD and CSMWG members.

Chris ROBERTS  
Acting Secretary, IHO CSMWG  
30 Aug 2006