

8th CSPCWG Meeting  
Turku, Finland, 29 November – 2 December 2011

Paper for Consideration by CSPCWG  
Progress with revision of S-4 Section B-300

<b>Submitted by:</b>	Secretary
<b>Executive Summary:</b>	Update on progress with the revision of S-4 B-300.
<b>Related Documents:</b>	WG Letter 03/2011
<b>Related Projects:</b>	None

**Introduction / Background.**

Work plan item A5 is revision of S-4 B-300. For ease, this has been broken into 2:

A5.1 covering B-300-330;

A5.2 the remainder B-340-390.

The first round of **A5.1** was circulated by WG Letter 03/2011 and about 20 responses were received. The votes on specific questions were mostly consensual and give us clear guidance on those particular issues. The individual comments and suggestions were, as usual, helpful and can generally be accommodated in the next round. **There were a minority of subjects for which it may be helpful to have a brief discussion at this meeting**, to give the officers a steer on how to progress 'round 2'. These are detailed below.

**A5.2** is being progressed (rather slowly) by Secretary and Chairman. Again, **a few issues have arisen for which a short discussion may help our progress.**

**Analysis / Discussion.**

**A5.1: Roads; cliffs; ramps** – 3 pages follow

**A5.2: 6 small items** – 1 page follows

**Action required of CSPCWG.**

The CSPCWG is invited to advise Secretary and Chairman on these issues to assist the revision of S-4 Section B-300.

### **B-300.3c Roads in harbour areas:**

- c. **Large-scale Harbour plans** (usually larger than 1:30 000): Topography of relevance to the mariner should be most detailed in areas immediately adjacent to the coast (up to about 1 mile inland) and to areas further inland which are clearly visible from seawards (e.g. on a sea-facing hillside) or the navigable parts of rivers. **There is usually no need to chart roads at this scale.** Outside these approximate limits, only significant buildings and other fixing marks should be shown.

**AU** only charts roads that are important to port infrastructure; are prominent from seaward and hence can be used as a navigational aid (e.g. there is a road in Sydney that runs straight up the side of a step hill from the coast, which is used by mariners as a fixing aid); or roads on the approach to a bridge over water navigable at the scale of the chart (to indicate the purpose of the bridge). AU has no objection to the wording in this paragraph, but this should be taken into account when reviewing **B-365**.

**DE** wondered about the last sentence. Especially in large scales roads will be charted.

**NZ** Regarding the statement ‘There is usually no need to chart roads at this scale.’ – There is possibly no navigational purpose but they help the mariner locate facilities e.g. customs office, harbourmasters office. We think roads are useful for this purpose. Also, this statement contradicts **B-320** second paragraph.

**Question: what is the consensus view about the usefulness of road layouts on large scale harbour charts?** The answer will have impact on later sections of B-300.

**B-312.1, (B-365) Steep coast, cliffs:**

A coast **backed by rocky cliffs** must be **charted** with the cliff **top** in its true position on large-scale **charts**. On medium scales the **cliff top** may have to be displaced inland slightly for the symbol to be **shown** clearly.



**C3**

A **steep coast without rocky cliffs** should be charted by hachures, thus:



**C3**

**AU** does not distinguish between the nature of its steep coast on its paper charts. We have only one type of computer generated cliff symbol that we use in all cases to indicate steep coast. Do other HOs distinguish between rocky cliffs and steep coast without rocky cliffs?

**FR** To answer AU's question, FR does not distinguish between the natures of its steep coast on its paper charts too.

**NZ** The new steep coast symbol needs to be less prominent, as the hand drawn symbol is more prominent than the cliff symbol.

**ESRI** From the industry's perspective, it would be ideal if the Working Group could collaborate with the industry to derive symbols to replace C3 that satisfies the WG, Mariners and, from a technology standpoint, are feasible to implement. We have tried to emulate these symbols with software, however, as you can imagine, it is difficult to achieve the effect of scribed symbols with software.

**Question: how many countries distinguish cliffs from steep coast? Note: Advice from navigators is that the radar image of cliffs is very different from a steep coast.**

## **B-324.1 Ramps, etc**

A **Slipway** is a reinforced slope where vessels may be constructed or repaired. Slipways **must be shown in accordance with the principles** above. The **international legend** ‘Slip’ should be used where necessary to avoid misinterpretation; lettering should be upright.



A **Patent slip** (Marine railway, US usage) is a slipway with rails for ship cradles. They should be distinguished on the largest scale charts by two parallel lines inserted down the centre of the slip. A legend may be added to help identify the feature:



**AU INT1 F23** includes the term Ramp. There is no corresponding S-4 guidance for depicting ramps on paper charts. In AU we use the legend “Ramp” to distinguish between a slip and a ramp (boat ramps are much more prevalent in Australia than slipways, although most are associated with small craft, but we still chart them on port charts). Suggest that some guidance be included in S-4 for ramps.

The term “patent slip” is defined in S-32 using the term “marine railway” (according to S-32, patent slip is UK usage). AU has attempted to tidy this clause up a bit, and add some guidance for depicting ramps, in the amended draft submitted with this response. AU further suggests that one of the symbols at F23 in INT1 (preferably the bottom left one), include the legend “Ramp” in upright text.

**Slipways must be shown in accordance with the principles** above. The **international legend** ‘Slip’ should be used where necessary to avoid misinterpretation; lettering should be upright. **Patent slips** (ie slips with rails for ship cradles, also known as marine railways), may be distinguished by two parallel lines inserted down the centre of the slip and a legend used to identify the feature.

**Ramps** must be shown, where required, as for slipways. The legend ‘Ramp’ should be used where space permits to avoid misinterpretation; lettering should be in upright.



**US** This section does not clearly differentiate between a “slipway”, which according to S-32, is an inclined surface in which a vessel is constructed, a “marine railway (patent slip)”, which is a TRACK and WINDING mechanism for hauling vessels out of the water for servicing and then vessel can be released back down the track, and “ramp”, which is a sloping structure that can be used as a landing place. A real-world ramp may have parallel guiding structures or be just a sloping surface. It is difficult to tell from the images shown in B-324.1 (or INT 1 F23) which function is being served by which symbol unless labels such “mar railway”, “ramp” or “slip” are added. It would be helpful if the appropriate symbol was shown in S-4 after each individual feature is addressed, such as patent slip. In the U.S., most marine railways (patent slips) are too narrow to be shown to scale, so a railroad track symbol is shown for the portion that is always dry.

**Questions: How should ‘marine railway/patent slip’, ‘slip/slipway’ and ‘ramp’ be distinguished? Note: S-32 defined a ramp as:** A sloping structure that can either be used, as a landing place, at variable water levels, for small vessels, landing ships, or a ferry boat, or for hauling a cradle carrying a vessel.

## **A5.2: B-340-390**

B-351.7 **Form lines:** Is symbol C13 still in use?

B-354.2 **Tree symbols:** Is there any value in having the ranger of distinctive tree symbols? Would the user notice and understand the difference between C31.1 and C31.2? C31.4-8 Other trees have distinctive outlines, eg scots pine, cedar, poplar, etc – why choose these?

B-361 **Canal TR:**

A note must be inserted on the chart, advising where the necessary nautical information concerning canals for inland navigation is to be found [IHO Technical Resolution 4/1919].

To what degree do HOs conform to this TR? Should we recommend it to be cancelled?

B-366 **Heliports:** is it useful to have a distinctive symbol for heliports, or is the standard airport symbol D17 adequate?

B-373.3 **Buddhist temple:** is there any value in retaining the special symbol for distinguishing Buddhist temple from other temples?  E16

B-390.2 **Views:** Do any HOs still chart panoramic views?