ISSOM 2018 Draft Comments – Selwyn Palmer

I’m surprised that symbol 411 in ISOM 2017 Vegetation, Impassable is not used in ISSOM draft.

So, the proposal would have 4 gradients of shaded runnability for ISSOM (405, 406, 408, 410) and 5 grades for ISOM (an added 411). I don’t really care what the final decision is, but consistency is highly commendable.

Index contour: Not defined in the draft pdf, but clarified in the changes text. No doubt it will be corrected.

Previously the symbol sizes for an ISOM map drawn at 1:10,000 (frowned on!) are the same as the sprint symbol sizes. In this ISSOM revision an index contour becomes 0.30mm. In ISOM at 1:10,000 it’s 0.38mm. Is the visible difference between a contour, 101 and an index, 102 materially different at 1:10,000 compared with 1:4,000? In my opinion index contours in ISOM are too fat. The compromise proposed for ISSOM is great. Let’s see it applied to ISOM.

Much to my delight, it seems that the only out-of-bounds symbols will be the olive 528.1 or purple coloured symbols.

I note that the out-of-bounds olive in ISOM is symbol 520.0 but is ISSOM draft it’s 528.1. And many of the black symbols also have different numbers. As a mapper I find this frustrating. My mapping technique is to write the symbol number on my mapping transparency. So will I have to remember two sets of numbers, one for forest maps, and the other for sprint maps?

Printing:

IOF are in bad mental tangle. They are now accepting CMYK colours for off-set printing. This makes dot screens for many symbols. Although they have suggested using a brown ink for brown symbols.

The off-set printed maps at WMOC in Estonia 2016 were far inferior to the digitally printed maps we did for WMOC in 2017.

529 for paved areas is a bit odd. Defining heavy v light pedestrian and/or vehicular traffic is a bit vague and possibly time dependent. I suspect I will continue mapping in one shade of brown.

To me, making a distinction between foot traffic paved and predominantly vehicle traffic paved would make more sense. But I can see that in a European context there are many shared walking cycling paths that are so dense with walkers or cyclists that running would be slowed.

Good to see 1:4000 accepted as the “shall-be” standard. Intrigued that 1:3,000 is recommended for youngest age groups. What about the oldest age groups?