**S-100 - Part 16A**

**HARMONISED PORTRAYAL OF S-100 PRODUCTS**

Contents

[1 Scope 1](#_Toc48147497)

[2 Conformance 1](#_Toc48147498)

[3 References 1](#_Toc48147499)

[3.1 Normative references 1](#_Toc48147500)

[3.2 Informative references 2](#_Toc48147501)

[4 Introduction 2](#_Toc48147502)

[4.1 Organisations and standards 3](#_Toc48147503)

[4.2 Application systems concepts and limitations 6](#_Toc48147504)

[4.2.1 ECDIS concept and limitations 6](#_Toc48147505)

[4.2.2 Integrated Navigation Systems (INS) 7](#_Toc48147506)

[4.2.3 Electronic Chart Systems (ECS) 7](#_Toc48147507)

[4.2.4 Other systems 8](#_Toc48147508)

[5 General principles 8](#_Toc48147509)

[5.1 Symbol harmonisation 9](#_Toc48147510)

[5.2 Visual interoperability 10](#_Toc48147511)

[5.3 De-cluttering strategies 10](#_Toc48147512)

[6 Display Organisation and Operation 11](#_Toc48147513)

[6.1 Display of significant features 11](#_Toc48147514)

[6.2 Operating modes 12](#_Toc48147515)

[7 Colours 12](#_Toc48147516)

[7.1 Colour assignment 12](#_Toc48147517)

[7.2 Colour tokens, profiles and palettes 13](#_Toc48147518)

[8 Text 14](#_Toc48147519)

[9 Pick reports 14](#_Toc48147520)

[10 Alerts and Indications 15](#_Toc48147521)

[11 Portrayal harmonisation between new versions of product specifications 15](#_Toc48147522)

[12 Dual-fuel systems 15](#_Toc48147523)

[13 Type approval considerations 16](#_Toc48147524)

[13.1 Minor deviations from registered symbols 16](#_Toc48147525)

[14 Portrayal considerations for product specification development (informative) 17](#_Toc48147526)

[14.1 Content harmonisation 17](#_Toc48147527)

[14.2 Harmonisation of portrayal catalogues 17](#_Toc48147528)

[15 Specifications for the display screen 18](#_Toc48147529)

[15.1 Physical display requirements 18](#_Toc48147530)

[15.2 Guidelines for reproducing features and symbols 18](#_Toc48147531)

[15.2.1 Size and complexity 18](#_Toc48147532)

[15.2.2 Zooming 19](#_Toc48147533)

[15.2.3 Summary of principles for reproducing features and symbols 19](#_Toc48147534)

[15.3 Colour display capability 19](#_Toc48147535)

[Appendix 16a-A Organisations and Standards 20](#_Toc48147536)

# Scope

This Part specifies the principles for harmonising portrayal and other presentational functionalities across different S-100 based data products for the purpose of improving the user experience and reducing ambiguities within systems utilising multiple S-100 based data products. It also describes the relevant International Maritime Organization (IMO) guidance and resources within International Hydrographic Organization (IHO) that support efforts in portrayal harmonisation. It does not address the portrayal process, functionality, or architecture, which are addressed in other S-100 Parts (especially 9 and 9A), but instead focuses on presentational design aspects, such as display organisation, colours, and symbology.

# Conformance

This Part is not a profile of an ISO or other standard. Instead, it is based on – and, where possible, conforms to – specifications for the portrayal of S-57 Electronic Nautical Charts (ENCs) and general principles for ergonomics and human-computer interaction (HCI). Much of this document is derived from the IHO S-52 standard, especially clauses 2, 3 and 4 of S-52.

This Part is based on specifications that evolved from studies and discussions by IHO, IMO, International Electrotechnical Commission (IEC), and manufacturers. These efforts resulted in a set of related standards and specifications promulgated by IHO, IMO, and IEC, which are cited in the references section of this Part and summarised in Clause 4.1. The general principles for ergonomics and human-computer interaction (HCI) have been described in various HCI and ergonomics publications.

# References

## Normative references

A.1021(26) Code on Alerts and Indicators (2009), IMO Resolution A.1021(26), 2009.

IEC 61174 Maritime navigation and radiocommunication equipment and systems – Electronic chart display and information system (ECDIS) – Operational and performance requirements, methods of testing and required test results. International Electrotechnical Commission (IEC), Edition 4.0, 2015.

IEC 62288 Maritime navigation and radiocommunication equipment and systems – Presentation of navigation-related information on shipborne navigational displays – General requirements, methods of testing and required test results. International Electrotechnical Commission (IEC), Edition 2.0, 2014.

MSC.191(79) Amendments to the Performance Standards for the Presentation of Navigation-Related Information on Shipborne Navigational Displays, IMO Resolution MSC.191(79), 2004. As amended by MSC 466(101).

MSC.232(82) Revised Performance Standards for Electronic Chart Display And Information Systems (ECDIS), IMO Resolution MSC.232(82), 2006.

MSC.252(83) Performance Standards for Integrated Navigation Systems (INS), IMO Resolution 252(83), 2007.

MSC.302(87) Adoption of Performance Standards for Bridge Alert Management, IMO Resolution 302(87), 2010.

MSC.466(101) Amendments to the Performance Standards for the Presentation of Navigation-Related Information on Shipborne Navigational Displays (Resolution MSC.191(79)), 2019.

MSC.1593 Interim Guidelines for the Harmonized Display of Navigation Information Received via Communication Equipment, IMO MSC.1/Circ.1593, 2018.

MSC.1609 Guidelines for the Standardization of User Interface Design for Navigation Equipment, IMO MSC.1/Circ.1609, 2019.

SOLAS V Safety of Life at Sea, Chapter V, Safety of Navigation, SOLAS Chapter V, 2002.

SN.243/2 Guidelines for the Presentation of Navigational-Related Symbols, Terms and Abbreviations, IMO SN.1/Circ.243/Rev.2, 2019.

## Informative references

CSS2 Cascading Style Sheets, Level 2 (CSS2) Specification, W3C Recommendation 12-May-1998, REC-CSS2-19980512, World Wide Web Consortium, May 1998. URL: http://www.w3.org/TR/1998/REC-CSS2-19980512 (retrieved 2020-08-12).

CSS2.1 Cascading Style Sheets Level 2 Revision 1 (CSS 2.1) Specification, W3C Recommendation 07-June-2011, REC-CSS2-20110607, World Wide Web Consortium, June 2011. URL: http://www.w3.org/TR/2011/REC-CSS2-20110607 (retrieved 2020-08-12).

IALA G1105 Shore-side Portrayal Ensuring Harmonisation with E-Navigation Related Information, International Association of Marine Aids to Navigation and Lighthouse Authorities, Edition 1, 2013.

IEC 60945 Maritime navigation and radiocommunication equipment and systems – General requirements – Methods of testing and required test results. International Electrotechnical Commission (IEC), Fourth Edition, 2002.

IEC 61924-2 Maritime navigation and radiocommunication equipment and systems – Integrated navigation systems – Part 2: Modular structure for INS – Operational and performance requirements, methods of testing and required test results. International Electrotechnical Commission (IEC), Edition 1.0, 2012.

IMPA-PPU Guidelines on the Design and Use of Portable Pilot Units, International Maritime Pilots’ Association, 2016.

ISO 19117 Geographic Information - Portrayal. ISO Standard 19117 Edition 2, 2012.

RTCM 10900.6 RTCM standard 10900.6 for Electronic Chart Systems (ECS), Radio Technical Commission for Maritime Services, July 2015.

S-4 IHO Publication S-4, Regulations of the IHO for International (INT) Charts and Chart Specifications of the IHO, Edition 4.8.0, October 2018. (Parts B and C in particular.)

S-52 IHO Publication S-52, Specifications for Chart Content and Display Aspects of ECDIS, Edition 6.1.1, June 2015.

# Introduction

In any system where several types of data products and sensor inputs will be used on a common screen, there is a need to harmonise their portrayal in the user interface. Harmonisation is needed to ensure users are not misled by, for example, contradictory symbology, text or colours. Harmonisation can also reduce the risk of the screen becoming overloaded with information. Portrayal harmonisation is also needed to reduce the user burden in terms of training requirements and the quantity of visual variables which must be memorised and considered in assessing information displayed on screens, and to give improved predictability for system implementors. The IMO has developed guidance for presentation of e-Navigational related information and this guidance should be leveraged for any portrayal harmonisation framework.

This Part contains portrayal harmonisation guidance that describes how S-100-based products should be used and displayed simultaneously. It is an overarching statement of principles which applies generally to all S-100-based Product Specifications. Since the guidance does not depend on particular Product Specifications, flexibility is possible in the approach to designing and developing portrayal, and user interfaces, which should make it unnecessary to amend all involved product specifications should any additional product specifications be identified, or any portrayal rules need amendment.

One important aspect of this guidance is defining the classes of user system to which any guidance applies, as there are a great variety of potential users of S-100-based products. For purposes of portrayal harmonisation, this document divides applications and systems into the following broad categories (in practice often a matter of configuration and task rather than equipment or software):

* ECDIS, INS, and similar navigation display systems and applications - primarily used for route planning and monitoring, and collision avoidance, with ENC as primary geographical data; covered by SOLAS and require type approval for meeting carriage requirements;
* Electronic Charting Systems (ECS) and similar systems and applications (e.g. PPU) - primarily used for route monitoring and voyage planning, with ENC or equivalents as the primary data; type approval not required;
* Other types of S-100 based user systems and applications, including shore systems.

Most S-100 based product specifications to date have been developed for ECDIS. ECDIS is a long-established and well documented concept, and since other users of S-100-based products are likely to know how the ECDIS concept relates to their systems, ECDIS is therefore the best-known user system upon which to model the portrayal harmonisation guidance.

Given the importance of ECDIS and other navigation displays (for route monitoring or voyage planning) to marine transport, this Part defines principles focused on such navigation displays as well as more general principles intended for other application domains.

## Organisations and standards

Several organisations are involved in developing standards and guidelines for portrayal, alerts and indications, and other user interface elements. Figure 16a-1 below depicts the main organisations which contribute to the development of user interface standards and other specifications, and the main influences between different kinds of standards/specifications. The current set of standards and specifications relevant to portrayal and the user experience can be characterised as follows:

* Presentation, performance, and user experience standards for ECDIS and INS are generally developed under IMO control, and include standards and guidelines for display and user interaction, including alerts. Specification of navigation-related symbols, including chart symbols, have generally been assigned to IHO as the subject matter experts.
* The framework for data content and display is defined in IHO standards, primarily in the form of the S-100 standard, supplemented by the IHO Geospatial Information (GI) registry as a repository of data object concepts, type definitions, and symbology. S-100 also provides an abstract specification for visual interoperability for displaying multiple products on the same screen; the only concrete specification for interoperability at the time of writing is S-98, which covers EDCIS interoperability.
* Specifications for individual data products are produced by several organisations depending on the specific domain. Standards covering geographic data and marine services are developed by IHO, weather and ice-related product specifications is generally under WMO responsibility, navigational warnings are an IHO/IMO joint effort by the WWNWS sub-committee, specifications for Inland ENCs are produced by the Inland ENC Harmonisation Group (IEHG), and IEC manages a standard for route exchange[[1]](#footnote-1).
* A product specification should (or must?) include the symbols and portrayal rules for the data product, however where this is not included, the system can specify the portrayal rules for the resulting products. System specified portrayal rules should also follow the portrayal harmonisation guidance.
* Standards for testing operation and performance of equipment and systems are developed under IEC control. A cybersecurity standard is under development.

The various categories of standards and specifications are generally interrelated and often co-dependent. IMO navigation and safety standards refer to IHO symbology for representing geographic features, IHO symbology is defined taking into account user interface guidelines in IMO standards, and the IEC operational, performance, and testing standards influence and are influenced by both IMO and IHO documents. Individual product specifications are based on the S-100 framework and are referenced by testing guidelines. Product specifications are based on the S-100 framework and the features and attributes in their data models, as well as the symbols and colours they specify for portrayal of the data, should all be in registered in the IHO GI Registry. These interrelationships are depicted in Figure 16a-1.

**Developers must conform to the mandatory requirements of the particular standards which apply to an application or system. In case of a conflict between this Part and a mandatory requirement in an applicable cited standard, the requirement in the standard supersedes the guidance in this Part.**

Summaries of the various standards and specifications are provided in Appendix A.




Figure 16a-1 – Overview of organisations, specifications, and user interface standards

## Application systems concepts and limitations

This clause describes the concept and limitations of the main types of application systems covered by this Part. The focus of this clause is on considerations that affect content and behaviour.

### ECDIS concept and limitations

Electronic Chart Display and Information System (ECDIS) means a navigation information system which with adequate back-up arrangements can be accepted as complying with the up-to-date chart required by regulations V/19 and V/27 of the 1974 SOLAS Convention, as amended, by displaying selected information from a system electronic navigational chart (SENC) with positional information from navigation sensors to assist the mariner in route planning and route monitoring, and if required display additional navigation-related information.

The concept of ECDIS is outlined in the introduction section of the IMO Performance Standards MSC 232(82). The following contains additional ECDIS related considerations.

1. ENC is an integral part of ECDIS and therefore should be defined as the base layer for the portrayal harmonisation framework. Additional layers can be classified as two main types, additional information to that of the ENC or enhanced information to that of the ENC. Additional information would be information that is not contained in the ENC, while enhanced information are layers that contain improved, detailed or higher resolution information than the ENC.
2. ECDIS, used together with official data, [is] accepted as complying with the up-to-date charts carriage requirements for nautical publications required by regulation V/19 of the 1974 SOLAS Convention amended in 2009. Electronic chart systems not meeting these ECDIS specifications of IHO and IMO, or ECDIS using non-official data, are known as ECS (Electronic Chart Systems).
3. Chart information may be used in conjunction with a radar overlay on ECDIS. Integration of tracked radar targets provided for collision avoidance radar (ARPA), targets tracked by AIS (Automatic Identification System) into the ECDIS display is another option, as well as other navigational information may be added to the ECDIS display. With the advent of S-100, additional types of data may also be occasionally added to the ECDIS display, especially high-density bathymetry, surface current and water levels data or predictions, maritime safety information (MSI), and underkeel clearance area data.
4. Colours and symbols defined in the S-101 portrayal catalogue are conceptually based on the symbology of conventional paper charts. Due to the special conditions of the ECDIS chart display as a computer-generated image, the ECDIS presentation of ENC data may differ from the appearance of a conventional paper chart, especially when simplified portrayal mode is used. There may be considerable differences in symbology in shape, colour and size, and in the placement of text in particular.
5. ECDIS combines chart and real-time navigational positioning information. Modern navigation systems (i.e. GNSS) may offer a more accurate positioning than was available to position some of the surveys from which the digital chart data ENC was derived. Further, other products may not be encoded to the same accuracy or precision as ENC data or ship’s positioning.
6. The display categories specified in the IMO Performance Standards and the IHO priorities of the various types of chart information (alarms, updates, mariner's and non-HO chart data, etc.) are applied to features by the display plane and drawing order assignments in individual portrayal catalogues. The drawing order may be modified if interoperability is activated.
7. Depth information should only be displayed as it has been provided in the ENC and not adjusted by tidal height. If the ECDIS has integrated the use of a S-100 based tidal product specification, it may display the adjusted tide as an italicized offset to the sounding in the ENC.
8. In the initial period of S-100 roll-out, S-100 compatible ECDIS are likely to be “dual-fuel” in that they will have both S-57 and S-101 ENCs. It is possible that there will be situations where the navigation screen has to display both S-57 and S-101 ENCs. The user experience aspects of such situations are discussed in Clause 12.

### Integrated Navigation Systems (INS)

The concept of INS is outlined in the IMO Performance Standards MSC 252(83). INS workstations have multifunctional displays providing at least route monitoring and collision avoidance functions, and may provide manual or automatic navigation control functions. In addition to these functions, an INS generally also provide route planning, navigation control data and status, and alert management functions. INS integrate sources, data, and displays into one navigation system. An INS may consist of multiple task stations.

Since the concept of ECDIS is included in the INS concept, the principle described in 4.2.1 of ENC as the base layer applies - but in the context of an INS it applies to components playing the role of an ECDIS. Components playing other roles may use ENC or similar data, but this may depend on function and task.

The considerations related to portrayal and user interaction for an INS are outlined below:

1. An INS may have multiple workstations, and the considerations for a workstation depend on the task it is being used for at the moment.
2. An INS may substitute for some carriage requirements for navigational equipment. The INS is required to fulfil the requirements for the systems it replaces. For example, an INS component used for the tasks of route monitoring and route planning must meet the requirements for an ECDIS, which are described IMO MSC 232(82). This means that the portrayal and user interaction considerations for an ECDIS described in clause 4.2.1 apply to the workstation playing the role of an ECDIS.
3. All tasks of an INS should use the same electronic chart data and other navigational databases such as routes, maps, tide information. If ENCs are available, they should be used as a common data source for INS.
4. The INS should support mode and situational awareness on the part of the operator and take human factors into consideration to keep the workload within the capacity of the operator.
5. An INS should combine, process and evaluate data from connected sensors and sources. Data integrity should be monitored. Failure of data exchange should not affect any independent functionality.
6. The INS should offer default display configurations for the tasks route monitoring and collision avoidance selectable at each task station to provide the bridge team and pilot with a standardised display. This configuration should be accessible by a simple operator action.
7. The INS should provide operational modes for open sea, coastal, confined waters (pilotage, harbour berthing, anchorage). It is recommended that the INS provide means to generate pre-defined or operator-defined display modes, that are optimally suitable to the navigation task.
8. Integrated graphical and alphanumeric display and control functions should adopt a consistent human machine interface (HMI) philosophy and implementation.
9. Information should be presented consistently within and between different sub-systems. Standardised information presentation, symbols and coding should be used according to resolution MSC.191(79).
10. The alert management should distinguish between unacknowledged and acknowledged alarms or warnings. A caution should be indicated by a steady visual indication. No acknowledgement should be necessary for a caution.

### Electronic Chart Systems (ECS)

ECS is a common denominator for all systems that portray electronic charts. RTCM 10900.6 defines Electronic Chart System as an electronic navigation system which complies with the requirements it sets or in IEC 62376. ECS systems may meet the ECDIS requirements, have additional functionality or be a simple tablet or phone with a GNSS function and capabilty to show electronic charts. RTCM 10900.6 gives a grading of ECS systems from Class A through D; where Class A is equal to an ECDIS backup and Class D is any device “intended to plot the position of ships that do not operate offshore. They are not required to have all of the functionality of a Class C ECS. They are required to display electronic chart information and plot a ship’s position, but are not required to display eMSI, or to monitor the ship’s position or to provide voyage planning or voyage monitoring functionality”.

The graphical appearance of charted areas on the screen is usually similar to that of an ECDIS, with elements (e.g., borders or off-graphic indicators) added. These systems will generally also have additional data products loaded, for example official products containing Marine Protected Areas or Marine Radio Services, or unofficial products such as points of interest (POI) to leisure craft users.

ECS may provide functionality not available on ECDIS and while ECS may not be as constrained as ECDIS, such systems, if intended for shipboard use (e.g. Portable Pilot Units (PPU)), should, as far as practicable, follow the same principles for symbology and colours. Their text display elements, display organisations, pick reports, and user interfaces may be more elaborate than ECDIS (so as to allow users more access to information or more detailed information), but should have compatible structure and functionality (e.g., similar prominence for significant features, user interface labels and menu items should have the same meanings).

This principle is based on reducing, as far as possible, the cognitive switching penalty**[[2]](#footnote-2)** when switching from planning to monitoring tasks on shipboard. The constraints in this clause are therefore less applicable to systems not intended for shipboard use (though *actual* use versus *intended* use must be considered).

### Other systems

Portrayal harmonisation is also beneficial in other systems, such as those that cover shore-side and specialised systems not intended for onboard route monitoring or ship movement monitoring or control, or other tasks allocated to an ECDIS, INS, or ECS. An example of such shore side systems is Vessel Traffic Management Information System (VTMIS). VTMIS can be regarded as an extension of a Vessel Traffic Service (VTS), since its main purpose is an Integrated Maritime Surveillance system. VTMIS incorporates other resources to allow associated services and other stakeholders to directly share VTS data or access to certain subsystems in order to increase the effectiveness of port or maritime activity operations as a whole, but may not relate to the purpose of the VTS itself.

VTMIS are generally specified individually to the specific VTS but may by governed by national or regional regulations. For example, Directive 2002/59/EC of the European Parliament governs VTS inspections of European Maritime Safety Authority (EMSA) member countries. IALA provides guidance about portrayal of data and information in shore-side systems, including VTMIS (e.g. G1105 – Shore-side Portrayal Ensuring Harmonisation with E-Navigation Related Information).

Generally, ENC charts form the base layer in a VTMIS and other data sources form layers of additional information to aid the VTMIS operator in monitoring and decision making. Examples of additional layers included radar and AIS for target tracking, AIS-ASM (AIS Application Specific Messages) for sensor information such as met-hydro information, air gaps and special zones such as irregular speed zones. Moreover, radio services may form an integral layer for service assistance. Other examples include MSI such as navigational warnings and meteorological warnings. Oceanographic information such as surface currents and water level may also be important layers.

# General principles

IMO Guidelines for the Presentation of Navigational-Related Symbols, Terms and Abbreviations (SN.1/Circ.243/Rev.2) notes in section 15, the principles applied when designing the appendices to the guidelines. Not all these principles are directly applicable to harmonisation of portrayal between data products as they are mainly applicable for Human Machine Interfaces. However, even the principles that are not directly applicable still provides important indirect guidance that can positively influence portrayal harmonisation. Particularly noteworthy principles are:

* consistency in use of symbols and patterns referencing Appendix 2 which provides information on icons, symbols and abbreviations that require standardization. Consistency enables recognition and detectability across the user interfaces of different navigation systems. Humans react positively to patterns and logical groups of items, and use categories to search for individual bits of information. User testing can identify groupings and patterns of information that should be prioritized for consistency. Patterns incorporate the way in which someone uses information and the types of information that are grouped together.
* using location and grouping for consistency provides for recognition. Human perception and search work faster with cues than complete recall, especially when aided by consistency. The user must recognize where information is, or how to perform a process. In performing functions, the user should not need to recall where something is located, or the process for doing something. This is the ability for the user to recognize an event, process or information flow rather than recall the detail of how to get to that point. This is integral to usability.
* prevent errors by ensuring users always see navigational critical information. Prevent errors, emergency exit – Continuous testing during development will identify possible error paths that can be removed. Users should be aware of how to navigate back to the start of a process, and also be aware of where they are in that process. The user should always be able to see navigation critical information even if layers of information are interlaid with the ENC/Radar.

Portrayal harmonisation must also consider if there should be a fixed set of layers that must within the scope of the rules or if the rules should be more flexible to accommodate additional layers, such as future products or regional specialities.

* a fixed list of layers gives predictability for implementers, since most variables are known and can be accounted for.
* a fixed list of layers is inflexible since new layers cannot be added without creating a new version of the rules and implementers may need to update user systems to add new layers.
* a flexible list of layers necessitates that the rules be more general and therefore easier to maintain, with less likelihood of having to create a new version of the rules for new layers. Also, users may create their own combinations and add layers as per need, such as in regional special circumstances.
* a flexible list of layers gives implementors less predictability of what layers to expect with higher possibility of unexpected layer combinations. This necessitates more testing and more flexible user settings to accommodate user defined layer combinations, and avoid clutter that impact system usability.

Portrayal harmonisation guidelines apply to both vector and coverage type data as far as practical.

## Symbol harmonisation

Symbols are used to visually convey information and when utilized in the same environment, e.g. marine, need to convey consistent information regardless of which product they are used in. As noted in IMO SN.1/Circ.243/Rev.2, “consistency enables recognition and detectability across the user interfaces of different navigation systems. Humans react positively to patterns and logical groups of items, and use categories to search for individual bits of information. User testing can identify groupings and patterns of information that should be prioritized for consistency. Patterns incorporate the way in which someone uses information and the types of information that are grouped together”. Symbols should therefore be harmonised for products used in the same general class of system/application to ensure the risks of contradictory messages are reduced as much as possible.

Symbols should be designed in accordance with the guidance within IMO SN.1/Circ.243/Rev.2 and IHO S-4. These two documents should be the first source of finding portrayal for features that need visualization in a navigation system. If suitable symbology is not found in either of these documents, the IHO Nautical Cartography Working Group (NCWG) is tasked with coordinating portrayal for IHO related products and may be able to offer assistance. Given IHO’s leadership in defining the portrayal of the chart, all organizations that produce data products intended for the navigation screen or related systems should coordinate the development of any new symbology with IHO NCWG.

New symbology should be tested within the product itself, and also in all expected product combinations to ensure sufficient harmonisation and that any risk of ambiguities is sufficiently addressed.

## Visual interoperability

The Interoperability Catalogue Model, see Part 16, is a framework that can be used to create a catalogue of rules for how to combine set of layers. This set can be a fixed list or a flexible approach.

The S-100 product specifications may have only considered portrayal harmonisation with ENC. Therefore, when several layers are visualized simultaneously there is a risk of clutter that may obscure significant features and increase the risk of unsafe operation. The Interoperability Catalogue Model framework should be utilized to limit the number of simultaneous on-screen layers to a logical set, for example by using the preconfigured combination function in normal operating mode, whilst permitting more flexibility for users with specialized requirements. Logical sets can be viewed as those layers useful in a particular operation. Within a logical set significant features should be given priority. Significant features should be regarded as those features that should not turned off at any moment during important operations, such as route monitoring in navigation systems. In ECDIS and ENC significant features are considered to be in the display base. In other S-100 based products and systems there may also be significant features and these should be considered in the same spirit as the display base defined in the IMO ECDIS performance standard (Resolution MSC.232(82)). Great care should be taken when combining layers to minimise the risk of obscuring any significant feature.

It is theoretically possible to combine endless amounts of layers; however, clutter will quickly cause degradation of the user screen and limit its usability. It is therefore advisable to try to limit the number of simultaneous layers to only what is strictly necessary to perform a specific task on the user system. When considering how a particular interoperability catalogue should account for multiple layers portrayed simultaneously in a given system, it should be noted that at an interoperability workshop that KHOA/KRISO/NOAA held in Daejeon in 2017, it was found that it is expected that only 2 to 3 layers will be required in any given operation in a navigation system. It is therefore recommended that as far as possible only 2 to 3 layers be displayed simultaneously. Considerations should be given to making the use of the pre-defined combinations of Product Specifications concept to limit the possible combinations, and to assign viewing groups to specific pre-defined combinations of Product Specifications.

## De-cluttering strategies

All S-100 based product specifications that include portrayal need to consider decluttering strategies. This is necessary to reduce the risk of clutter when conforming data products are utilized in user systems either in isolation or as a layer within a larger ecosystem. Any S-100 based products used in isolation may cause screen clutter in a system when used at a scale where the screen density of the data content start interfering with each other. Similarly, when S-100 based data products are used as layers in a system, the data density may be such that the content start interfering with each even at larger scales due to quantity of content. Either scenario need to be considered by product specification developers and system implementers, and mitigation strategies need to be employed.

One clutter mitigation strategy that can be employed is to introduce scale bands in the products to limit data density at the various scale ranges by generalization at lower scales, including thinning for raster data, while including the greatest detail at the largest scales. This method works best on the individual product series as it cannot account for impacts of any other layers, but adding scale bands can be part of an overall clutter mitigation strategy for the most feature dense products.

A second mitigation strategy can be adding scale minimum and scale maximum attributes to portrayed feature classes to turn off less significant information at either small scales or large scales. The scale minimum attribute is used as a limit to indicate the scale at which portrayal of a feature is turned off as the screen is scaled to smaller scales, for example by turning off point symbols that start interfering with each other due to density at smaller scales. The scale maximum attribute is used to turn off the feature portrayal at large scales, for example large areas that may be considered of less significance at large scales and can cause clutter, for example by area patterns. This method works best on the individual product series as it cannot account for impacts of any other layers, but can be part of an overall clutter mitigation strategy.

Configuring an interoperability catalogue can be a third mitigation strategy by defining rules for how predefined combinations of products should interact, by for example turning off less significant features in one product to enable easier identification of more significant features in another products. Interoperability catalogues can also be used to define rules for combining data from different products into hybrid features that can eliminate the need to portray the original data. Utilization of an interoperability catalogue is most suitable for situations where multiple layers interact and are at risk of causing screen clutter.

These three strategies are not mutually exclusive and any combination of them can be utilised as well as in combination with other methods for clutter mitigation. Additional strategies are discussed in the subsequent sections.

# Display Organisation and Operation

Some systems have detailed specifications and requirments established, e.g. ECDIS. Other systems may have less strict rules and requirements but may follow similar patterns in full or in parts of other performance standards. Examples of such systems can be Portable Pilot Units (PPU) which may follow some of the ECDIS performance standards because they are both used in the same environment and utilize much of the same data, additionally PPUs may have local adoptations to the regions they are utlized in. In general, the parts of portrayal guidance that relate to display organization and system operation are applicable to all S-100 based product specifications regardless of the intended systems that will use the S-100 based data that derive from these product specifications (though systems may provide elaborations on basic organisations, as outlined in Clause 4.2.2 of this Part).

## Display of significant features

Significant features are features that contain information that is important for safe operation of the intended system. For navigation systems, guidance is provided in IHO S-4 on how to determine and manage significant information and should be used as a guideline when efforts are made in defining what is a significant feature in a given context. For example, in section B-340 of S-4 a landmark is described as: “A landmark is any natural or artificial object prominent from seaward, at a fixed location on land, which can be used in determining a location or a direction”. Other types of important features can be regulatory areas that impact movement and therefore should not be obscured by less significant regulatory areas that may for example only limit certain seabed activities. Similarly, features that describe outages to aids to navigation are important information for mariners and should not be obscured by for example contour lines. Reasonable efforts should be taken to ensure that significant features are not obscured by less significant information. In some cases, the more significant features may be in a different product and reducing risk of significant features being obscured must therefore be managed in cooperation between two or more product specification teams where these products are expected to be used simultaniously in the same system.

The primary method to resolve potential conflicts should be utilization of display priority assignment in the respective portrayal catalogues. Significant features should have the highest display priority (drawn last) to ensure that less significant features are not displayed more prominently. This solution can also work between products.

In cases where other solutions are impractical, it may be necessary to amend data models to ensure that significant features are not obscured or made ambiguous by the product interaction between two or more products in a user system. Product Specification developers should make use of metadata to define which products’ interactions are anticipated, and work with the responsible parties to ensure the maximum feasible harmonisation. S-100 metadata has the layer identification attribute in dataset discovery metadata that can capture information about expected layer interactions.

S-100 based data producers should have production procedures that include guidelines for harmonising features between products that are complementary or share similar concepts. Such guidance should also consider situations where several producers in a region provide navigationally significant products.

For example; ENCs are produced by a Hydrographic Office while the Coast Guard produces products that contain information about Marine Radio Signals and Marine Traffic Management. The two organizations should harmonise their production procedures to ensure significant features are harmonised between the three products.

## Operating modes

Some systems (e.g., ECDIS) are designed with different colour modes to account for ambient light conditions on the bridge of the vessel. These modes support an operating environment that preserves the navigator’s light sensitive vision which can be critical in spotting situations that impact safety of navigation, especially at night. It is strongly recommended that all S-100 based product specifications that are intended for navigation screens support the operating modes of the navigation system where the data product is intended to be used. Note that IMO/IEC performance requirements for certain systems, such as ECDIS, may require such support. Manufacturers and users of S-100 products whose portrayal catalogue does not have a suitable colour mode for any combination of system type and lighting conditions are invited to discuss the matter with IHO.

The IHO ENC Standards Maintenance Working Group (ENCWG) is tasked with managing S-52 - Specifications for Chart Content and Display Aspects of ECDIS which specify the portrayal rules for S-57 ENCs. The Nautical Cartography Working Group is tasked with coordinating portrayal. Jointly these two working groups may be a good source for advice on colour usage in different portrayal operating modes.

Given IHO’s leadership in defining the portrayal of the chart, all organizations that produce data products intended for the navigation screen should coordinate their colour usage with IHO. Recommendations for colour usage in different portrayal operating modes on ECDIS will be published in an Annex to the IHO ECDIS interoperability specification.

# Colours

Colours and combinations of colours often have specific meanings associated to them; this is also true for navigation displays. For example, on a chart black usually means a physical object or boundary (e.g. coast line), while magenta usually means a non-physical object or boundary (e.g. restricted area boundary). Other examples include buoyage systems marks where combinations of yellow and black bands are used to indicate a cardinal direction from a known danger.

Another consideration with colour choices is that any symbology using red may be an issue for any system operated in night conditions as these symbols may become very difficult to distinguish in red ambient light often used to preserve night vision. Therefore the use of red should be avoided where possible and always used with a symbol shape that improves recognition. Adding text can also reduce risk of mix-ups.

With so many implications on colour choices for portrayal, it important to ensure that the use of colour is harmonised between layers and systems to reduce the risk of giving the user ambiguous information. IHO S-4 and IMO SN.1/Circ.243/Rev.2 provides useful guidance to use of colours and it is recommended that these guidelines be adhered to by all S-100 based product specifications that are intended for use in a navigation context.

Given IHO’s experience and leadership in defining the portrayal of the chart, all organizations that produce data products intended for the navigation screen should coordinate their colour usage with IHO. Within IHO the Nautical Cartography Working Group is tasked with coordinating portrayal.

## Colour assignment

Colour assignments for ECDIS, INS, and any similar navigation systems covered by IMO Performance Standards must conform to the categorisation in Table 16a-1 below.

Colour assignments for bridge or charthouse systems not covered by IMO Performance Standards for navigation systems should conform to Table 16a-1 for the classifications described in the table, but may add other colour assignments as necessary for their purposes.

Colour assignments for other systems should use colour assignments compatible with Table 16a-1, but may depart from the list in Table 16a-1 or extend it, depending on application requirements or user environments.

| **Colour** | **Usage** |
| --- | --- |
| black/white | (black by day / white by night) is used for critical navigation features which need highlighting by contrast against their background to give them adequate prominence. Examples are the own-ship symbol, dangerous soundings equal to or less than the safety depth, buoys, conspicuous objects on land etc. It is also used for text, which is less clear in any other colour. |
| white/black | (white by day / black by night) as a background area shade is used for deep, safe, water. |
| magenta | is used to highlight critically important features such as isolated dangers,  traffic routes, anchorages; and for restricted areas, submarine cables, gas pipelines etc. It is also used for aids to navigation and services such as daymarks, racons, and pilot stations. |
| grey | is used for many features which are black on the paper chart. It is used with thick lines for critical physical objects such as bridges and overhead cables, and with thin lines for important but less critical physical features such as non-dangerous soundings, sandwaves, overfalls, water pipelines and fish farms. It is similarly used for chart features such as fairways, harbour areas, tidal information and for information about the chart such as quality of chart data, overscale areas, etc. |
| grey | as a background area shade is used with a prominent pattern for no-data areas. |
| blue | as a background area shade is used to distinguish depth zones. |
| blue | as foreground colour for AIS and VTS information; also reserved for future requirements. |
| green | is used for the radar image and synthetics, and for buoy and lights colours. |
| blue-green | is used for transferred ARPA. |
| yellow-green | ('moss-green') as a background area shade is used for the intertidal area  between high and low waterlines. |
| yellow | is used as the manufacturer's colour; for the mariner's transparent colour fill;  and for buoy and lights colours. |
| red | is used for the important planned route, for the mariner's danger highlight, and  for buoy and lights colours. |
| orange | is the mariner's colour, for notes, chartwork, chart corrections. The scale bar,  north arrow, and mariner's navigation objects such as EBLs and VRMs are  also orange. |
| brown | as a background area shade is used for the land, and dark brown is used for  features on land and in the intertidal area that do not have any strong  significance for navigation. |

Table 16a-1 - Colour assignments for navigation systems

## Colour tokens, profiles and palettes

S-100 based product specifications use the S-100 portrayal concept which consists of several components that can be registered in the GI Registry and may therefore be shared among different product specifications. Colour tokens and colour profiles are examples of such shareable concepts. The colour tokens are used in portrayal catalogues to specify the particular variation of a general colour using an address in RGB and/or CIE colour space coordinates. Historically, several colour tokens have been assigned to specific usages within ENC for concepts such as depth areas, land areas, regulated areas, buoys, lights, etc. These feature concepts may be reused in any S-100 based product specifications, which may also add their own colour tokens. This necessitates harmonisation of the use of colour tokens. When a feature concept is portrayed by two or more product specifications it is recommended that the same colour tokens are used in all portrayal catalogues.

# Text

IMO MSC.191(79), as amended, requires in section 5.2.3 that text be presented using simple unambiguous language that is easy to understand. Navigation terms and abbreviations should be presented using the nomenclature defined in the Guidelines and encouraged their use for all shipborne navigational systems and equipment (see SN.1/Circ.243, as revised and Appendix 2 of IMO MSC.1/Circ.1609). Similarly, S-4 (Section 500 - Text: Language, Numbers, Abbreviations, Names, Styles and Fonts) has defined common navigation terms and abbreviations that are used in the presentation of navigational information. This textual guidance should jointly with the IMO guidance be used as a reference for harmonising the use of text in S-100 based Product Specifications intended for navigational use.

It is recommended that the guidance in IMO MSC.1/Circ.1609 be adhered to as it notes that when icons, terms and/or abbreviations are used, these must meet the requirements of the guideline. Moreover, it is noted that where a standard term, abbreviation, or icon is not available, another icon, term or abbreviation may be used, but these should not conflict with those listed in the aforementioned guideline. Therefore, where terms or abbreviations are not available in IMO MSC.1/Circ.1609; IHO S-4 and IMO SN.1/Circ.243, as revised, should be examined for suitable alternatives. Only when these guidelines have been examined and found to not contain the suitable terms or abbreviations, should considerations be given to creating new terms or abbreviations. If new terms or abbreviations are created after due consideration of the above mentioned recommendations, efforts should be made to add the new terms or abbreviations to the suitable guideline to ensure harmonisation.

While the above mentioned IMO instruments are specifically intended for ECDIS, other classes of systems or applications intended for use in the marine context should use the same terms and abbreviations.

# Pick reports

IMO Circular 1609 notes that “[l]arge variations in the user interfaces of electronic equipment can significantly inhibit an operator's effectiveness in performing navigational tasks. Where there is significant variation in buttons, icons, actions, workflows, processes, units of measure or location of information, there is a commensurate increase in the time required for equipment familiarization and the risk of operational error, particularly in challenging navigational situations”. Pick reports have historically been defined for the individual product specification or by the implementor, leaving room for ambiguity that has led to difficulties for users. Additional challenges for the user may occur when two or more products that are being used simultaneously have conflicting configurations for pick reports. Similar complications can also be encountered when different systems in use have significantly different user interfaces for the same type of data. This would also require additional training to familiarize users with products that can be safety critical. Harmonised portrayal pick reports should therefore be a goal for any system that will use S-100 based products.

Pick reports should allow access to information from all visible/enabled underlying products. Data should be organized to facilitate navigation through complex reports in a manner that is logical when considering the layer order visual on the screen. Human Machine Interface (HMI) strategies should be well-thought-out to make the task of reviewing the pick report requiring as little effort as possible for the user. This can be facilitated by harmonised look and behaviour across products and systems when used in the same operational mode or same context. This implies that product specifications remain flexible on how pick reports are designed. Flexibility should also be given to permit some variation between operation modes where appropriate. Pick reports should have a sort order that reflect priority of the products on the screen.

Depending on the system, harmonisation of pick reports should be facilitated either by;

* A guideline that describes a common structure for pick reports, including when used in combinations of more than one product. Product Specification developers must consider the boundaries of the guideline during Product Specification development. OEMs implement their interpretations of according to guideline.
* The OEMs, using IMO guidance, define how their system display pick reports when products are used in combinations. Noting especially IMO Circular 1609 which states its focus is on “standardization of user interfaces provided for INS, ECDIS, radar and other relevant equipment where applicable, whether the equipment is stand alone or part of a mixed/integrated solution”.

# Alerts and Indications

All product specifications that are intended for a navigation context should specify any feature combinations that match one or more of the areas for which alert or indication should be given to ensure there is a harmonised implementation in user systems. Such specification could be done using a machine-readable alerts and indication catalogue, but caution is needed as this catalogue will likely be developed for one specific system, such as ECDIS. Therefore, implementers may find that some of the content of an alerts and indication catalogue is not applicable for a non-ECDIS system and only a subset should be utilized. This may also necessitate development of additional system specific alerts or indications.

IMO Resolution MSC.232(82) states in 11.3 and 11.4 and their sub paragraphs how an ECDIS should respond to risk of crossing, dangers, prohibited areas or areas with special conditions. In Appendix 4 and Appendix 5 of the same resolution details of which areas ECDIS should detect and provide an alert or indication for are given. This guidance is sufficiently high level that it should be useful for most S-100 based products and other relevant systems, and should therefore be consulted when designing alerts and indications.

Within IHO the ENC Standards Maintenance Working Group (ENCWG) is tasked with managing S-52 - Specifications for Chart Content and Display Aspects of ECDIS which specify the portrayal rules for S-57 ENC. This includes guidance for which feature attribute combinations should be considered to match the IMO ECDIS Performance Rules on alerts and indications. Given IHO’s leadership in defining the portrayal of the chart, all organizations that produce data products intended for the navigation screen should coordinate their alert and indication rules with IHO.

# Portrayal harmonisation between new versions of product specifications

S-100 based product specifications are largely maintained using the S-100 maintenance regime, which classifies revised versions as clarifications, corrections, or new editions. These categories correspond to increasing significance and complexity. New functions are generally recommended to be in a new edition. This means that new portrayal elements, such as new symbols, may require a new edition of a product specification. The reasons behind such new symbology can be varied, such as changes to IMO guidelines, new user requirements or new technology. When new editions are required, it is important to carefully consider the impact of any portrayal change, as significant changes may have major consequences on equipment and users. If there is proper justification for a significant change to portrayal between version of a product specification, appropriate means should be taken to communicate these changes with sufficient time for users and systems to adapt. The standard lifecycle process detailed in IHO Resolution 2/2007, as amended, should be adhered to for IHO products; other organisations should either use the same process or adopt an equivalent process.

# Dual-fuel systems

Dual-fuel systems are systems that use both older (pre-S-100) and newer (S-100) data products that contain the same type of information (for example, S-57 and S-101 ENCs).

It is anticipated that global uptake of S-100 data products will not be uniformly implemented For example, national hydrographic offices may implement S-101 ENC production according to different schedules, or a single HO may commence production of S‑101 ENC datasets for different parts of their national waters at different times, or co-produce data in both old and new formats for a period.

All stakeholders should anticipate a transition period during which new S-100 formats increasingly replace older formats. This means systems must support both older and newer formats during the transition period, which in turn means that such systems must have rules governing the processing of data when equivalent products in both formats are available. For example, a dual-fuel ECDIS must be able to handle both S-57 ENC and S-101 ENC during the transition period. For areas and scale bands where both products provide data coverage, the data in the two products will be nearly identical, and it will therefore be important to specify which one has priority. In general, it is expected that systems give the newer formats priority over the older formats, and only utilize data from the older format when there is no coverage of the new format data at an appropriate scale for intended use.

Amplifying the earlier recommendation: S-101, being the new and improved format, should always be given priority over S-57 when the data coverage is equivalent at the screen scale. This gives both implementors and data producers predictability for how layer interaction will work in S-100 compliant systems.

The inclusion of layers is generally dictated by need. ECDIS, for example, can have additional layers to ENC for supporting route planning and route monitoring operations, see IMO Resolution MSC.232(82), sections 1.6 & 7.1. Other systems may include layers for similar or different reasons. Uses of the layers in a system range from overlay to integrating two or more layers into a hybrid layer. The layer integration is governed by system performance standards and an interoperability catalogue (see Clause 5.2). The interoperability catalogue concept (see Part 16) has been designed for S-100 based product specifications and may anticipate S-101 ENC or S-401 IENC as a base layer. Therefore, in areas without S-101 ENC or S-401 IENC data, system implementors and data producers should expect layers to be operating as overlays over S-57 ENC or IENC data.

The question of handling simultaneous display of data in old and new formats is still to be addressed by the IHO at the time this document is being prepared. In the interim, systems should:

1. Indicate when the screen is displaying older-format data;
2. If both new and old formats are being simultaneously displayed (one part of the screen is displaying new-format data and another old-format data), indicate the boundary between new and old-format datasets;
3. Anticipate that newer formats align with the portrayal of the older formats during the transition period, so that dual fuel systems will not show significant differences in portrayal of what is essentially the same data in different formats or between different regions where S-100 adoptions are occurring at different paces.

# Type approval considerations

Certain classes of systems require type approval, for example ECDIS. This clause is mandatory for such systems but can be considered guidance for design principles for all other systems that deviate from the supplied portrayal catalogue for an S-100 based product.

## Minor deviations from registered symbols

It is acknowledged that the manufacturers of navigational equipment and software are in constant contact with users. This contact allows for fast response to suggestions for improvement to the portrayal. The following criteria serve as a guide for judging whether any symbolisation on a system which is visibly different from the symbolisation provided by the portrayal catalogue of a product specification and as demonstrated by the relevant Test Data Set print-outs is still compliant. The symbolisation used:

1. should be the same in general shape and size as the portrayal catalogue version;
2. should be clear and sharp so that there is no ambiguity over meaning;
3. should be comparable to the portrayal catalogue version to avoid ambiguity in meaning between that model and any other model of similar systems;
4. should use only the colours as specified in the portrayal catalogue;
5. should comply with the various considerations of scientific design described in the portrayal catalogue;
6. should comply with the priority of prominence on the display in proportion to importance to safety of navigation which is built into the portrayal catalogue, and
7. should avoid any increase in clutter.

Any symbolisation which does not meet these criteria is not compliant.

The type-approval authority is strongly encouraged to contact the organisation responsible for the product specification in question, in any case of uncertainty over differences in symbolisation, ideally attaching graphics to illustrate the situation. The responsible organisation should give the reason for the particular symbolisation on the relevant Test Data Plots, and should comment on any perceived advantages or disadvantages of the manufacturer's version, with reasons.

# Portrayal considerations for product specification development (informative)

## Content harmonisation

The application schemas of S-100 based products that are likely to be displayed together should be harmonised to the largest degree possible in an effort to reduce the risk of conflicting messages between products. Significant variation between systems has been noted as leading to inconsistency in the way essential information is presented, understood and used to perform key navigation safety functions (IMO SN.1/Circ.243/Rev.2). As products are usually considered part of the system, standardised and harmonised content of products is part of the solution to reduce the noted risk. Product Specification developers should strive to maintain a data model that is as harmonised with related data models as possible. Due considerations should be taken before developing a concept that is different but functionally equal to similar concepts in other product specifications.

In order to standardise and harmonise content between products, first priority should be given to resolving the overlap, by for example removing the overlap from the least prioritised Product Specification. In establishing that there is a priority of concepts, the Product Specification developers should consider the use of the overlapping products where feature concepts need to remain different, but the information content is equivalent and the use is intended for a similar context. Here considerations should include the update cycle of the information in the different products. Priority should be given to the concept and product that is most likely to be updated more frequently. The Interoperability Catalogue (see Part 16) concept should be considered as a method to configure systems to supress the least prioritised product or concept. Moreover, it is important that considerations also include any relations that the concepts have to other feature concepts. Consequences of breaking any relations between concepts must be considered when choosing which concept to give the priority.

EXAMPLE: Developers investigate the update cycles of real-time current data products and discover that they are updated more frequently than Current – Non-Gravitational and Tidal stream – Flood/Ebb features in a navigational chart product. The features from the real-time current products are therefore preferred replacements for navigational chart product current features. Note that the question is decided not by comparing dates encoded in features, but on the basis of real-time data that is available on an ongoing basis versus historical information gathered at a past date.

## Harmonisation of portrayal catalogues

The S-100 Portrayal Catalogue model uses the viewing group concept to control the content of the display. It works as an on/off switch for any drawing instruction assigned to the corresponding viewing group. The concept can be seen as a filter on the list of drawing instructions (ref S-100, 9-11.1.3). S-100 based products that will be portrayed on the same screen should have viewing groups harmonised so that overlaps of information do not cause significant features to be obscured by less significant features.

Product Specification developers should endeavour to eliminate undesirable overlaps with viewing groups used by other Product Specifications. Viewing groups are listed in the GI Registry, and the viewing groups register can be used to search for available viewing groups. Tools like S-100 viewers can also be used to review the visual effects of combined display of datasets for different data products.

# Specifications for the display screen

This clause describes general requirements for display screens. More detailed requirements are provided in specific standards applicable for different classes of systems. For example, IMO MSC 232(82) specifies the requirements for ECDIS.

## Physical display requirements

The minimum effective size of the geographic portion of the display should be such that key information is generally visible without scrolling the display and user interaction directly with the geographic display, if any, is possible without requiring excessive user concentration under typical conditions.

The details of how this principle applies to particular systems should be determined by analysing user tasks and user performance under expected and critical environmental conditions. Touch target sizes should take typical viewing distances into account.

Particular classes of systems may have minimum sizes set by controlling standards, for example, MSC 232(82) requires for ECDIS that the minimum effective size of the chart presentation for route monitoring is at least 270 mm × 270 mm.

## Guidelines for reproducing features and symbols

### Size and complexity

Lines and symbols and text should be large enough that they can be easily interpreted at the operational viewing distance. In a navigation system this will be about 70 cm for route planning, but experience to date indicates that the viewing distance for important features during route monitoring may be several metres.

Human factors experts quote a minimum requirement that symbols and characters subtend 20 arc minutes at the observer’s eye. (For example, a symbol viewed from 70 cm for route planning should be about 4mm in size, 1.5 times the size of a normal chart symbol. Two times chart size is a good general rule.) Symbols and characters important for route monitoring may have to be significantly bigger.

Enough "picture units" (pixels) must be used to draw small features and symbols clearly and allow viewers to distinguish similar symbols. For clear representation, symbols require a minimum number of screen units (pixels), depending on their complexity. For example, a simple chart symbol should extend about 4 mm for an ECDIS standard screen.

Symbols should always be drawn with at least the same number of pixels as are required to draw the symbol at the size defined in the Portrayal Catalogue for the minimum resolution and minimum chart display area.

EXAMPLE 1: The minimum height for a symbol is 4 mm and the pixel size for a display of minimum size and resolution (chart window size 270mm × 270mm; resolution 864 × 864 lines) is 270/864 = 0.3125 mm. The minimum height of the symbol in pixels is 13 (4 mm divided by 0.3125 mm, rounded up).

EXAMPLE 2: The minimum height for a symbol is 4 mm and the pixel size for a display[[3]](#footnote-3) of minimum size and resolution is 0.26 mm. The minimum height in pixels of the symbol is 16 pixels (4 mm divided by 0.26 mm, rounded up).

### Zooming

When the display scale is enlarged by zooming in, it should be possible to hold symbol size constant. The same applies to text. Symbol and text size should never be decreased when zooming out.

### Summary of principles for reproducing features and symbols

This clause is a synopsis of the guidelines in clauses 15.2.1 and 15.2.2 concerning the size of symbols.

Note that clause 15.2.1 does not establish definitive or uniform sizes in absolute units (mm) or physical display units (pixels). The sizes of symbols on any particular display will depend on expected viewing distances and display characteristics. Instead, clauses 15.2.1 and 15.2.2 establish the principles which must be followed:

* Lines and symbols and text should be large enough that they can be easily interpreted at the operational viewing distance.
* Based on general human factors research, symbols should be sized so as to subtend an angle of at least 20 arc minutes at the observer’s eye at operational viewing distance.
* Enough “picture units” (pixels) must be used to retain the distinguishing characteristics of symbols, in order to allow viewers to distinguish similar symbols.
* Zooming in or out should not result in symbols or text appearing disproportionately large or illegibly small.

Clauses 15.2.1 and 15.2.2 provide more details and examples of how the principles apply for specific combinations of display characteristics.

## Colour display capability

Colour displays should be capable of at least 256 luminance steps in each of red, green and blue.

For night performance it is essential that the hardware has a graphics card capable of giving "blacker than black", i.e. complete control of colour, and that the software can control that function.

Displays must be capable of maintaining colour discrimination between symbols defined in the portrayal catalogues for the data products which may be used for tasks performed on the display. Typical users should be able to distinguish between colours which may be specified for the symbols they encounter in the performance of the task using the display.

Particular classes of systems may be subject to specific standards for colour conversion tolerances. For example, the ECDIS standards for colour conversion tolerances and colour calibration are described in the applicable ECDIS requirements, performance and test standards.

Specifications for particular classes of systems (in particular, ECDIS) may include a colour differentiation test diagram. This diagram is intended:

1. for use by the mariner to check and if necessary, re-adjust the controls, particularly for use at night;
2. for use by the mariner to verify that an ageing display remains capable of providing the necessary colour differentiation;
3. for initial colour verification of the day, dusk and night colour tables.

Appendix 16a-A Organisations and Standards

**16a-A.1 International Organisations and Standards**

The IMO has issued recommendations and guidelines on how to present navigation related information. Of particular significance are the documents noted below.

* MSC.191(79), Recommendation on Performance Standards for the Presentation of Navigation-Related Information on Shipborne Navigational Displays, specifies the presentation of navigational information on the bridge of a ship, including the consistent use of navigational terms, abbreviations, colours and symbols, as well as other presentation characteristics. It also addresses the presentation of navigation information related to specific navigational tasks by recognizing the use of user selected presentations in addition to presentations required by the individual performance standards adopted by the Organization.
* IMO SN.1/Circ.243/Rev.2, Guidelines for the Presentation of Navigational-Related Symbols, Terms and Abbreviations, stems from a compelling user need for greater standardization to enhance usability across navigation equipment and systems. Significant variation between systems and equipment produced by different manufacturers has led to inconsistency in the way essential information is presented, understood and used to perform key navigation safety functions. Improved standardization of navigation systems will provide users with more timely access to essential information and functions that support safe navigation.

MSC.191(79) and guidelines in SN.1/Circ.243/Rev.1 continue to apply as follows:

* + To radar equipment, electronic chart display and information system (ECDIS) and integrated navigation systems (INS) installed before 1 January 2024; and
  + To all other navigational displays on the bridge of a ship installed before 1 July 2025.

MSC.191(79), as amended by resolution MSC.466(01), and guidelines in SN.1/Circ.243/Rev.2 are to be applied to equipment installed on or after the dates specified above[[4]](#footnote-4).

* MSC.1/Circ.1593, Interim Guidelines for The Harmonized Display of Navigation Information Received Via Communication Equipment, provides interim guidelines for the display of navigation-related information received via communication equipment. It aims to ensure that information is displayed in an efficient, reliable and consistent format, in a manner that is easily interpreted to support decision-making. These Guidelines supplement the Performance standards for the presentation of navigation-related information on shipborne navigational displays (resolution MSC.191(79)) in regard to the presentation of navigation information received via communication equipment. The use of these Guidelines will ensure that navigation information received via communications equipment is displayed in a harmonised manner on the ships' navigational bridge.
* IMO MSC.1/Circ.1609, Guidelines for the Standardization of User Interface Design for Navigation Equipment, apply to Integrated Navigation Systems (INS), Electronic Chart Display and Information Systems (ECDIS) and radar equipment. They may also be applied to other electronic navigation equipment, and navigation sensors, where applicable, to improve standardization and usability. The aim of the Guidelines is to promote standardization of user interfaces to help meet user needs. The Guidelines have been developed in close collaboration with an international association of equipment manufacturers to ensure its efficient implementation. These Guidelines also aim to leave room for future innovation and development while still addressing the primary user need for standardization and usability. Improved standardization of the user interface and information used by seafarers to monitor, manage and perform navigational tasks will enhance situation awareness and safe and effective navigation.
* IMO Resolution A.1021(26), Code on Alerts and Indicators (2009), defines a classification of alerts (as emergency alarms, alarms, warnings, and cautions) and provides general design guidance and principles for achieving uniformity of type, location and priority for required alerts and indicators, as prescribed by SOLAS, other international conventions, shipping codes, and IMO performance standards and guidelines.
* IMO MSC 302(87), Performance Standards for Bridge Alert Management, describes performance standards for harmonising the priority, classification, handling, distribution and presentation of alerts.
* IMO MSC 252(83), Performance Standards for Integrated Navigation Systems (INS) describes requirements for the integration of navigational information, task-related requirements, alert management, and documentation requirements for an INS. These requirements supplement the performance standards for individual components. MSC 232(86) applies to equipment installed in 2011 and after; its predecessor, Annex 3 of MSC 86(70), applies to equipment installed from 2000 to 2010.

The IEC Technical Committee TC80 have developed standards for equipment, general and performance requirements, methods of testing, and symbols for selected non-geographic information (e.g., ship activity, AIS, and radar information).

* IEC 61174 specifies the performance requirements, methods of testing and required test results of equipment conforming to IMO performance standards. This standard is based upon the performance standards of IMO resolution MSC.232(82). Reference is made, where appropriate, to IMO resolution MSC.232(82). It also includes relevant extracts from IHO publications (S-32, S-52, S-57, S-61, S-63 and S-64).
* IEC 62288 specifies the general requirements, methods of testing, and required test results, for the presentation of navigation-related information on shipborne navigational displays in support of IMO resolutions MSC.191(79) and MSC.302(87).
* IEC 60945 describes testing methods, operational tests and required test results for shipborne navigational equipment and electronic navigational aids. It is based on IMO Resolution A.694(17). IEC 60945 also covers shipborne radio equipment as well as addressing potential electromagnetic interference from other types of equipment.
* IEC 61924-2 describes requirements for the design, manufacture, integration, methods of testing and required test results for an INS to comply with the IMO requirements of MSC.252(83).

IHO standards and specifications describe data products, data content, data updating, and display, symbols and representations for geographic information, natural conditions, navigational hazards, and selected non-geographic information such as regulatory and administrative information.

ECS is a common denominator for all systems that portray electronic charts. RTCM 10900.6 defines Electronic Chart System as an electronic navigation system which complies with the requirements set forth in this standard or in IEC 62376. ECS systems may meet the ECDIS requirements (e.g., backup ECDIS) or be a simple tablet with a GNSS function. RTCM 10900.6 gives a grading of ECS systems from Class A through D; where Class A is equal to an ECDIS backup and Class D is any device “intended to plot the position of ships that do not operate offshore. They are not required to have all of the functionality of a Class C ECS. They are required to display electronic chart information and plot a ship’s position, but are not required to display eMSI, or to monitor the ship’s position or to provide voyage planning or voyage monitoring functionality”.

Portable Pilot Units (PPU) – The International Marine Pilots Association (IMPA) has issued a Guideline on the Design and Use of Portable Pilot Units. The guideline is high level, but stress that pilotage is a local mater and therefore no PPU solution can meet all needs in all pilotage areas. Therefore, PPUs are tailored to a particular pilotage area and there are a number of configurations that may be utilised.

Shore-side and specialised systems not intended for onboard route monitoring or ship movement monitoring or control, or other tasks allocated to an ECDIS, INS, or ECS see IALA G1105 – Shore-side Portrayal Ensuring Harmonisation with E-Navigation Related Information.

**16a-A-2. Historical Background (Informative)**

In 1986 the North Sea Hydrographic Commission completed a study on the consequences of the development of Electronic Chart Display and Information Systems (ECDIS) for Hydrographic Offices (HOs). Its conclusions included:

1. Specifications for standardised data content, format and updating procedures should be arrived at by a new IHO ECDIS Working Group as a matter of high priority.
2. To assure the integrity of Electronic Navigational Charts (ENCs), their production should be the responsibility of the Hydrographic Offices; the ENCs will be made available in a standard format and all equipment should be designed to accept it.
3. When official ENCs are available, ECDIS users should be required to carry them in full, and ECDIS manufacturers or other intermediaries should not make preliminary selections of data before supplying them to the mariners.

It was then decided to establish an International Hydrographic Organization (IHO) Committee on ECDIS (COE[[5]](#footnote-5)).

As several manufacturers were now developing these systems, it was of immediate importance to all concerned (Hydrographic Offices, mariners, national shipping authorities, and manufacturers) to have at least a first draft of the IHO and International Maritime Organization (IMO) guidance for both the Electronic Navigation Chart (ENC) and its display systems.

Therefore, the COE asked the Netherlands Hydrographer to prepare a working paper on ECDIS specifications to address the following issues:

1. Minimum and supplementary data content of the ENC and required characteristics of that data base such as the cataloguing of sea areas, density of digitization of chart data and reliability and worldwide compatibility of chart data and other nautical information produced.
2. Minimum and supplementary content of the ENC display, standards of symbols, colours and their standardised assignment to features, scale limitations of data presentation, and appropriate compatibility with paper chart symbols as standardised in the Chart Specifications of the IHO.
3. Methods for the timely updating of the ENC, and means to ensure worldwide compatibility of the correction system data.
4. Criteria for a standard format for exchange of digital data for the ECDIS between Hydrographic Offices and for supply to the data user, and procedures and financial aspects of such an exchange and supply

A first draft of the specifications was presented to IHO Member State Hydrographers in May 1987 at the 13th International Hydrographic Conference in Monaco. This draft was also widely distributed to National Shipping Authorities, mariner associations and manufacturers, for comment.

In November 1988, the COE established the Colours & Symbols Maintenance Working Group (CSMWG) to develop specifications and guidelines for chart symbol and colour definition for evaluation by hydrographic offices, ECDIS users, and manufacturers.

In January 1989, the Safety of Navigation sub-committee of the IMO Maritime Safety Committee noted the need to define symbols and colours for both chart and navigation purposes, and invited the Comité International Radio-Maritime (CIRM) and the IHO to make detailed technical proposals.

Work on ECDIS display design had already started, exemplified by the Canadian E.C. Testbed on the Norwegian "North Sea Project" in 1988. The CSMWG made its first report in September 1989, based on a study for the Netherlands HO by the TNO Perception Institute, and a review by the DCIEM Perception Institute, Toronto. The initial performance specifications were prepared in June 1990. Seven Cs GmbH, of Hamburg, developed a digital Provisional Presentation Library, under contract to Canada and the United States, leading to the development of the Presentation Library over the next two years, and culminating in the issue of the first operational editions after a meeting of CSMWG in November 1994. Meanwhile, more research and development in colours and symbols was carried out in Canada. Australia also provided support for completing the Presentation Library and the Mariner's Navigational Object catalogue which implements the IEC Navigational Symbols.

In parallel with the development of the IHO Specifications, the IMO/IHO Harmonising Group on ECDIS developed Provisional Performance Standards for ECDIS, which were first published in May 1989 by the IMO. An amended version of the Provisional Performance Standards was prepared in the light of experience and it was adopted in 1995 through IMO resolution A.817(19). The Performance Standards have incorporated many of the elements of the original IHO Specification. Therefore, S-52 now only provides the details of the hydrographic requirements for ECDIS.

Another parallel effort was carried out by the IHO Committee on Hydrographic Requirements for Information Systems (CHRIS), which developed the S-57, “IHO Transfer Standard for Digital Hydrographic Data.” S-57 describes the standard to be used for the exchange of ENC data. It was adopted by the 14th International Hydrographic Conference, Monaco, May 1992. The IHO Transfer Standard Maintenance and Application Development Working Group (TSMAD) currently maintains S-57.

While many of the general elements of S-52 were being incorporated into the IMO Performance Standards, the specifics were being expanded in the S-52, Appendix 2, "Colour & Symbol Specifications” into a model for presenting all chart and navigational objects on the ECDIS display, according to the developing IMO requirements. IHO published a provisional edition of the S-52, Appendix 2 in 1991 and the first operational edition, complete with Annex A, "Presentation Library", was issued in 1994.

After 1994, considerable maintenance to adapt the colours and symbols Specifications and Presentation Library to sea experience and to changes in S-57 was carried out in Canada, first by USL/CARIS of Fredericton and later by NDI of St. Johns, funded by the Canadian Hydrographic Service and the Canadian Coast Guard.

In 2001, the Federal Maritime and Hydrographic Agency of Germany (BSH), relieved the Canadian Hydrographic Service as the HO responsible for ECDIS Colours and Symbols. In 2004, a new edition bringing all accumulated deferred amendments into effect was issued. It included a detailed 'hard-copy' version of the symbol library developed at Hochschule Wismar, Fachbereich Seefahrt Warnemunde; in addition Furuno, Helsinki, provided the updated digital version for those who use it.

The version of S-52 published in 2008 focused on adapting Appendix 2, Annex A to the revised IMO ECDIS Performance Standards and the introduction of new symbology for Particular Sensitive Sea Areas, Archipelagic Sea Lanes and generic objects which may be used for future cartographic requirements initiated by the IMO.

In 2008, the 20th meeting of CHRIS endorsed the recommendation of the CSMWG to revise and restructure S-52 to accommodate the revised IMO ECDIS Performance Standards, MSC.232(82) and the associated new IEC 61174 Specification for ECDIS type approval testing. This has resulted in the creation of Edition 6 of S-52. All references to the previous IMO Performance Standards have been replaced with the appropriate references to MSC.232(82). The structure of S-52 has also been simplified; the S-52, Appendix 2 has been incorporated into the main portion of S-52 and the three annexes of the former Appendix 2 have become annexes to the main document. All of the Appendix 2 paragraph numbers have been retained in the newly integrated S-52 main document so that references to the former S-52, Appendix 2 may be mapped directly to the revised main portion of S-52.

CHRIS, which changed its name to the Hydrographic Services and Standards Committee (HSSC) in 2009, also changed the name of the CSMWG to the Digital Information Portrayal Working Group (DIPWG). The scope of the DIPWG was also redefined to include maintenance of all components of S-52, except for Appendix 1, “Guidance on Updating the Electronic Navigational Chart," which was delegated to the new ENC Updating Working Group (EUWG) to “review and revise.”

In 2016 HSSC working groups were reorganized and the newly formed ENC Standards Maintenance Working Group (ENCWG) was made responsible for all IHO standards which apply to S-57 ENC production and display, including S-52.

1. Other organisations are also developing S-100-based standards for information exchange, of varying relevance to portrayal and user interaction, shipboard or onshore. The list of product specifications in Figure 16a-1 is representative, not comprehensive. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. See, for example, “Multitasking: Switching costs”, American Psychological Association <https://www.apa.org/research/action/multitask>. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. For background, the CSS “reference pixel” is (effective CSS 2.1) defined as follows: “The reference pixel is the visual angle of one pixel on a device with a pixel density of 96dpi and a distance from the reader of an arm’s length. For a nominal arm’s length of 28 inches, the visual angle is therefore about 0.0213 degrees. For reading at arm’s length, 1px thus corresponds to about 0.26 mm (1/96 inch) … a reading distance of 71 cm (28 inches) results in a reference pixel of 0.26 mm, while a reading distance of 3.5 m (12 feet) results in a reference pixel of 1.3 mm.” [CSS2.1]

   Note that “px” is a CSS unit, not the physical display pixel. The definition has changed slightly from the 1998 CSS2 specification, which used a pixel density of 90dpi, giving a visual angle of 0.0227 degrees which means that 1px corresponded to about 0.28 mm for a reading distance of 71 cm (about 28 inches) and 1.4 mm at 3.5 m (about 12 feet). [CSS2] [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Anticipated dates are as of March 2020. Dates may be revised by IMO, and should be confirmed from the latest relevant IMO resolution/circular. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Subsequently renamed the Committee on Hydrographic Requirements for Information Systems (CHRIS) and now known as the Hydrographic Services and Standards Committee (HSSC). [↑](#footnote-ref-5)