

**AN ADDITION TO THE DISCUSSION ON UNIFORMITY
IN CHARTS AND HYDROGRAPHIC DOCUMENTS
AND A REFORM OF THE REPERTORY
OF TECHNICAL RESOLUTIONS**

by Stjepo KOTLARIĆ
Technical Assistant
Hydrographic Institute of the Yugoslav Navy

I.H.B. Introductory Note

As announced in the I.H. Bulletin of December 1964, we are publishing below the article sent to the Bureau in November 1964 by Mr. S. KOTLARIĆ, Technical Assistant at the Yugoslav hydrographic office.

We have only two further remarks to add to the comments in the Bulletin mentioned above. The first concerns the next edition of the Repertory of Technical Resolutions. Since Captain LANGERAAR's proposal needs to be studied at some length, the Bureau has decided to issue the 6th edition of this publication arranged in the usual way. It will appear in the course of this year.

The second remark refers to the proposal in paragraph 4 of Mr. KOTLARIĆ's article, namely, to appoint a commission to review the Repertory and to point out any disadvantages in its lay-out. We consider that such a commission is not necessary, and that the person in the best position to point out any imperfections is Captain LANGERAAR himself, since he first raised the question.

In our opinion, the most appropriate procedure to follow would be for the Netherlands to submit to the next Conference a proposal on the subject, accompanied by an explanatory note detailing the reasons prompting the proposed reform. The Conference will then decide, and the decision adopted will be applied to the 7th edition of the Repertory.

In the interim, we repeat our request that States Members consider the question and make known their opinions. We were pleased to receive, in addition to Mr. KOTLARIĆ's article, the three letters published below, giving the points of view of the United States, Brazil and Great Britain. Such comments are of valuable assistance in our review of the matter, and if other States Members will send their viewpoints, these opinions will provide a basis for discussion at the next Conference, and a quick decision on the question may thus be possible.

In former articles, "Uniformity in Charts and other Hydrographic Documents" and "With Regard to a Reform of the Repertory of Technical Resolutions", published in the International Hydrographic Reviews (July 1963, January and July 1964) a discussion has been raised on this question and comments requested.

After careful study of the matter I have found that the discussion on this subject was useful, and that there are some points whose consideration could be of use before submitting a final wording of a proposal for the solution of this question.

The present edition of the Repertory of Technical Resolutions is burdened with many corrections and a new edition should be printed without too much delay. It will be necessary, therefore, to solve the question of the reform of the Repertory before printing the new edition.

It is a well known fact that compilation and editing of a book, especially a technical manual, is very difficult to do without any deficiency. The question is, what is the number and character of such deficiencies, and accordingly what remedy should be taken to solve these drawbacks. Would a few correcting slips or a new printing of the book be sufficient, or is it necessary to apply a new system of arrangement to the book concerned?

Regarding the subject discussed I think it is necessary first to make a complete analysis of the Repertory to find all contradictions or inconsistencies, if any, and to discover other deficiencies whose correction might contribute to the easier use of the Repertory. Having these data at hand it will be much easier to arrive at an adequate solution, to make a better assessment of the advantages and disadvantages of the proposed changes and to make a final decision as to what must be done. If Captain LANGERAAR has perhaps made such an analysis and has these data at hand, it would be of great help to the I.H. Bureau in solving this question. But if there are no such data I propose that the Bureau should undertake the necessary action to collect these data. This should be done either by the Bureau's staff or by a special committee selected among the States Members which have sent to the Bureau their remarks and suggestions on this matter. The Bureau would then request these States Members to nominate their representatives for the committee charged with carrying out this analysis and making a report.

If the report should show that inconsistencies and deficiencies in the Repertory are either very few, or perhaps only those mentioned in the articles already published in the I.H. Reviews, I think we could be satisfied with the Repertory as a whole, because in the large number of resolutions drawn up by different persons throughout the years in the process of keeping the Repertory up to date only those few have escaped attention. Of course the inconsistencies discovered should be discussed to find out definitely if they were real inconsistencies. Eventual remedies to bring the Repertory to a more perfect state, which would render it of greater help to hydrographic offices, should be suggested.

Thus for instance, regarding the interpretation of resolutions B 134 I, B 137 IIb and B 147, it is a question of whether among them exists a real inconsistency. I consider correct the application of the principle of B 147

(i.e. brackets) to the underlined sounding figures for drying heights out of position; this practice is already adopted in many countries. Probably a case could be made out as to why sounding figures were used and not height figures, or some others. Arguments could be found both in favour and against this, but if we try to consider underlined sounding figures as those specially used only for drying heights, we shall not see any trouble in this matter. I have not found any confusion in the adequate interpretation of these resolutions and their corresponding symbols. However, finding these resolutions in the Index concerning Symbols and Abbreviations (by means of paragraphs Q 3 — Out of position, Q 14, 15 — Sloping figures and Upright figures, and Q 16 — Bracketed figures) [page XXXVIII of the Repertory] would be easier if these data were properly corrected. For instance, if the corrected index data for these paragraphs read as follows :

Section No.	TERM	REPERTORY	
		Part.-No.	Page
Q 3	<i>Out of position, for soundings</i>	B 137 IIb	53
		B 169	62
	<i>Out of position, for heights</i>	B 133	51
		B 147	56
	<i>Out of position, for drying heights.</i>	B 134 I	52
Q 14, 15	<i>Sloping figures; Upright figures ..</i>	B 147	56
		B 165	61
		B 137 IIb	53
Q 16	<i>Bracketed figures</i>	B 169	62
		B 133	51
		B 134 I	52
		B 147	56

A similar correction to the Alphabetical Index on pages XLVI and LII would also be desirable.

F

Figures :	Page	Resolution
Sounding; out of position (on charts)	53	B 137 IIb
	62	B 169

S

Soundings :	Page	Resolution
Out of position (on charts)	53	B 137 IIb
	62	B 169

Regarding the second inconsistency — i.e. the proposal 30 submitted to the VIIIth I.H. Conference, and discussed on page 13 of the July 1963 edition of the I.H. Review, in which a sounding figure in brackets was proposed when known depth over a wreck is plotted out of position on a chart — it can be seen that, in fact, this was originally proposed by Great Britain, Canada, South Africa and Thailand (see IHB circular letter 11-H of 1957, page 41), whilst the original IHB proposal was to insert such depths

in different type from ordinary soundings. Now we can consider this as past history because such a proposal was not adopted at the Conference and such a symbol does not exist in the Repertory. The proposed guiding resolutions (page 15 of the January 1964 edition of the IH Review), if inserted in the Repertory in the appropriate place would be of help to the Bureau (and other persons proposing new resolutions) in order to prevent any contradiction due to inattention or lack of familiarity with the existing resolutions.

On the other hand if we examine the selected example for the new arrangement of the Repertory, given on pages 13 and 14 of the July 1963 edition of the Review, we find that Fundamental Technical Resolution (FTR) 6200 and the system of Derived Technical Resolutions (DTR) 6201-6204 also have some deficiencies. So, for instance, symbols defined by resolutions B 135 (Rock which covers and uncovers), B 136 (Rock awash) and B 137 (Sunken rock dangerous to surface navigation) must not always be surrounded by the danger line, i.e. the dotted line, as was prescribed by the resolution FTR 6200. These facts are very well known in practice and we see them on the charts of many States Members. These symbols may be surrounded by the danger line or appropriate depth contour line, or even not surrounded either by the danger line or by the depth contour line, depending on the scale of the chart, the distance from the coast and the danger to navigation. Consequently, FTR 6200 and DTR 6201, 6202 and 6203 are not consistent with the existing resolution B 137 III already applied by many States Members. In this resolution it is stressed that when it is considered advisable to give additional prominence to the existence of a dangerous rock or to avoid confusion with other soundings, symbols for dangerous rocks may also be surrounded by a danger line or by an appropriate depth contour line. Accordingly, if resolutions FTR 6200 and DTR 6201, 6202 and 6203 were adopted, it would entail changing the existing resolution and the practice in many countries, and there is also the question whether such new FTR and DTR resolutions would be adopted by the majority of States Members. Such a change in the Repertory could in practice mean that after the uniformity of those symbols has been brought to a satisfactory state, we deliberately take the risk of losing such uniformity by changing the present resolution which is already adopted and applied in practice; such an action, in general, would not be advisable.

Regarding the wreck symbol defined by resolution B 141 Vb (Sunken wreck dangerous to surface navigation), if this were included in DTR 6204 it would cause the separation of one wreck symbol from the other wreck symbols which would also not be advisable.

From the above remarks we see that under the newly proposed arrangement of the Repertory even in a single selected example some inconsistency and deficiency could be found. Therefore it is problematical what experience we shall have if all present resolutions of the Repertory, and the great number of so-called Independent Resolutions, have to be inserted into that new system of FTR and DTR. It seems that the reasons for changing the present system of the Repertory are more of theoretical or experimental interest than of practical significance. I consider, however, that the explanations in Captain ALBINI's article (in the January 1964 edition of the Review) give reasonable arguments for the advantages of the present

system of arrangement of the Repertory and its correction. The resolutions can be thoroughly examined and corrected wherever necessary, but without changing the present system of arrangement of the Repertory.

Discussion on the necessity for the reform of the Repertory might be lengthy and prolonged for several years. To avoid such a situation, and to come sooner to a satisfactory solution, I would like once again to stress the necessity for the Repertory to be thoroughly searched in order to find out all real inconsistencies or contradictions which might exist among present resolutions, as well as to discover other deficiencies whose correction might contribute to easier and more practical use of the Repertory.

Comments by USC&GS and USNOO (letter of 1 March 1965)

“ We have noted with interest the articles in the past three issues of the International Hydrographic Review on the subject of the Bureau's Repertory of Technical Resolutions.

“ The present arrangement of the Repertory, wherein the various Resolutions are indexed by subjects, has been found to be entirely satisfactory to the personnel of our respective offices. The proposal of Captain LANGERAAR to divide the Resolutions into three categories is novel and requires careful study.

“ If it is decided that such a division of the Resolutions is desirable and a satisfactory determination can be made as to the proper classification of all existing Resolutions, the resulting compilation should be incorporated as a separate section of the book, perhaps listing therein only the numbers and subjects of the resolutions, to be used as a cross-reference.

“ We await, with anticipation, the publication of Mr. KOTLARIĆ's article in the next issue of the Review. ”

Signed :

H. Arnold KARO
Rear Admiral, USC&GS

Director
U.S. Coast & Geodetic Survey

Denys W. KNOLL
Rear Admiral, U.S. Navy

Commander
U.S. Naval Oceanographic Office