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**NCWG Letter 03/2024**

To NCWG Members 15 April 2024

Subject: Request for Comments: S-129 Portrayal

Dear Colleagues,

The S-129 Project Team for Under Keel Clearance Management Information is working on the S-100 based portrayal. With reference to our task to provide expertise and support to other IHO working groups reading the implementation of S-100, the S-129 Project Team has approached us with the request to provide feedback on their portrayal development.

S-129 Project Team’s schedule and approaching deadlines does not allow NCWG to follow an 8-week response time therefore, response is required in 4 weeks. Reply using the Response Form Annex A, **no later than 13 May 2024**. I ask you to use the ‘Reply to all’ option for responses, to ensure the full Working Group membership is aware of developing discussions.

Yours sincerely



Mikko Hovi

Chair NCWG

Attachments:

Annex A: Response form to NCWG Letter 03/2024

NCWG\_Letter\_03\_2024 S-129 Portrayal (Annex B and C)

**Annex A**

**NCWG Letter 03/2024 Response Form** **S-129 Portrayal**

Chair: mikko.hovi@traficom.fi Secretary: psheatsley@esri.com by **13 May 2024**

Copy responses to: Jason Rhee j.rhee@omcinternational.com and

Lindsay Perryman lindsay.perryman@amsa.gov.au

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Question** | **Yes** | **No** |
| 1 | Do you agree that the proposed *UnderKeelClearancePlan* feature’s boundary area Line Style (i.e. symbolised dashed line with “UKCM” text symbol) provides a LineStyle that is discernible from other S-100 boundary Line Styles?If no, please explain in the space below: |  |  |
|  |
| 2 | Do you agree that the CHMGD colour token, comprising the following colours, is the right colour token to be used for the *UnderKeelClearancePlan* boundary portrayal?* Day: #c045d1
* Dusk: #826ca1
* Night: #411247

If no, please explain and provide your preferred alternative colours with reasoning in the space below: |  |  |
|  |
| 3 | Do you agree that a 50% transparency applied to the *UnderKeelClearancePlan* boundary LineStyle will help mitigate portrayal conflict of this feature against other features?If no, please explain and provide your preferred level of transparency for the *UnderKeelClearancePlan* boundary in the space below: |  |  |
|  |
| 4 | Do you agree with the dimensions of the “UKCM” text symbol SVG underlying the *UnderKeelClearancePlan* boundary LineStyle?If no, please explain and provide your preferred dimensions (height and width) for the “UKCM” text symbol SVG in the space below: |  |  |
|  |
| 5 | Do you agree that a 50% transparency applied to the *UnderKeelClearanceNonNavigableArea* colour fill will help mitigate portrayal conflict of this feature against other features (e.g. route lines)?If no, please explain and provide your preferred alternative portrayal of the *UnderKeelClearanceNonNavigableArea* with reasoning in the space below: |  |  |
|  |
| 6 | Do you agree that the following proposed colours are suitable for portraying the *UnderKeelClearanceNonNavigableArea’s area* fill in Dusk and Night palettes*?** Dusk: #9b3549
* Night: #390e16

If no, please explain and provide your preferred alternative colours with reasoning in the space below: |  |  |
|  |
| 7 | Do you agree that a 50% transparency applied to the *UnderKeelClearanceAlmostNonNavigableArea* colour fill will help mitigate portrayal conflict of this feature against other features (e.g. route lines)?If no, please explain and provide your preferred alternative portrayal of the *UnderKeelClearanceAlmostNonNavigableArea* with reasoning in the space below: |  |  |
|  |
| 8 | Do you agree that the following proposed colours are suitable for portraying the *UnderKeelClearanceAlmostNonNavigableArea’s* area fill in Dusk and Night palettes*?** Dusk: #86491e
* Night: #301705

If no, please explain and provide your preferred alternative colours with reasoning in the space below: |  |  |
|  |
| 9 | Do you agree that adding a circle around the current “bow tie” symbol of the *UnderKeelClearanceControlPoint* feature will improve its visibility against other features (e.g. horizontal route lines)?If no, please explain in the space below: |  |  |
|  |
| 10 | Do you agree that the following proposed colours are suitable for portraying the *UnderKeelClearanceControlPoint*’ssymbol in Dusk and Night palettes*?** Dusk: #8ca6b3
* Night: #364147

If no, please explain and provide your preferred alternative colours with reasoning in the space below: |  |  |
|  |
| 11 | Do you agree with the dimensions of the proposed circle for the *UnderKeelClearanceControlPoint* symbol SVG?If no, please explain and provide your preferred dimensions for the circle in the space below: |  |  |
|  |
| 12 | Do you agree that the general direction of S-129 Portrayal draft is good, and that the S-129 PT should continue developing the S-129 Portrayal Catalogue based on the work presented in this paper?If no, please explain in the space below: |  |  |
|  |
| 13 | If you have any further comments, proposals or advice for the S-129PT on the S-129 portrayal, please write the in the space below: |
|  |

Further comments:

Date:
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Organisation: